

■ 96th Annual Convention Opening Business Session

Sunday Afternoon, January 13, 2002

The opening session of the 96th annual Convention of the NCAA was called to order at 4:30 p.m., with Executive Committee Chair Bob Lawless, president of the University of Tulsa, presiding.

OPENING REMARKS

Mr. Lawless: Good afternoon. For those of you in the back, we are only going to pass the collection plate from the No. 2 microphone back, so if you want to avoid it, you might want to come closer to the front. There are a lot of seats down here. It is up to you.

I am Bob Lawless, president of the University of Tulsa. It is my pleasure to welcome you this afternoon to the opening session of the 2002 NCAA Convention. I have the pleasure of leading this opening session and welcoming you to Indianapolis, the home of the NCAA.

I hope that all of you had the opportunity last night at the delegates reception to tour the Hall of Champions and to tour the headquarters office building. If you have not yet been over and toured the facility, I encourage you to take this opportunity to do so. It is a wonderful facility. It is very workable for the staff and it is something that I think the Association and all of the membership is very, very proud of.

With me today on the dais are the chairs of the three divisional governing presidential bodies. I am pleased to welcome on my immediate left, Brit Kirwan, Ohio State University, president of the Division I Board of Directors. On Brit's left, is Patricia Cormier, Longwood College, chair of the Division II Presidents Council. On her left is Tom Courtice, Ohio Wesleyan University, chair of the Division III Presidents Council. I would like you to welcome them today. (Applause)

Also on the dais is Ced Dempsey, NCAA president, and Robin Green, associate chief of staff for Division I and the governance liaison to the Executive Committee. Although she is not present on the dais, Condoleezza Rice, the National Security Advisor to the President of the United States, is standing by live at the White House and will join us by satellite in a few minutes to deliver our keynote address. Dr. Rice has also agreed to take a few of our questions after her comments.

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Mr. Lawless: I now need to give the annual report of Executive Committee actions over the last year. As you know, we have operated

with the federated governance structure for four years that provides for each division the autonomy to address its varying and diverse issues. However, it is important for us to keep in mind as we gather today that we still are one Association.

The Executive Committee has the authority and responsibility for overseeing the affairs of the entire Association. With that in mind, I would like to briefly report on the activities of this Committee during this past year.

As you are aware, the Executive Committee is composed of 16 chief executive officers from all three divisions. In October of 1999, the Executive Committee established four strategic planning priorities, which continue to serve us today as a framework for the Association's planning efforts.

These priorities are: First, to prepare student-athletes for leadership in a dynamic and diverse society. Second, to reinforce the values of fairness and integrity in intercollegiate athletics. Third, to increase access to higher education and enhance the collegiate experience; and finally, to highlight the capacity of intercollegiate athletics to foster life-long learning and health.

Divisions II and III have already implemented strategic plans that are based on these priorities and provide a basis for analyzing various initiatives and budgetary items. Division I is in the process of developing its own strategic plan.

As you know, each division reviews and approves its own divisional budget. The Executive Committee has the responsibility and the authority to review and approve the Association's overall budget. This fall, in response to the tragedies that occurred in New York City, Washington, D.C., and Somerset County, Pennsylvania, the Executive Committee authorized a \$5 million donation to the disaster relief efforts on behalf of all NCAA member institutions. This donation, now called the NCAA 911 Scholarships, is part of the families of Freedom Scholarship money and will provide educational assistance for post-secondary studies to financially needy dependents of those killed or permanently disabled as a result of the terrorist attacks or during the rescue activities related to those attacks.

This fund will be coordinated by the Assistance Scholarship Foundation of America, the country's largest nonprofit scholarship organization. I am sure that you are as proud as I am that we were able to join the rest of the country in providing assistance to those most directly impacted by these tragedies and that we will be able to help send young people to college for the next 29 years.

Another responsibility of the Executive Committee is to monitor the litigation in which the Association is involved. I am pleased to be able to report that the number of active cases against the Association is down one-third from four years ago. During the past year, the Association has had continued success in defending its policies in court.

Several of our victories have been as a result of years of hard

work. For example, after four years of litigation, the Cureton case was resolved this last May in the NCAA's favor, allowing the Association the right to determine the appropriate academic eligibility criteria for student-athletes to compete in intercollegiate athletics during their first year in college.

In other cases, our amateurism rules were successfully defended, preserving the important principle of the NCAA's mission. Although it is unusual for the NCAA to commence a lawsuit, the Association did so several times this last year to protect the equity it had built up in the NCAA name and to prevent trademarks from being abused by Internet sites associated with gambling. We have won each of those actions.

Another key issue that the Executive Committee grappled with during the past year was the use of the Confederate battle flag in the states of Georgia, South Carolina and Mississippi. In April 2001, the Executive Committee affirmed that the NCAA would honor its contractual commitments to conduct championships and other events in Georgia.

We believe that the issues related to the flag in the state of Georgia are resolved and that future NCAA championships and events may occur in the state. In August of last year, the Executive Committee took action regarding the states of South Carolina and Mississippi. The Committee approved a two-year moratorium on selecting any new NCAA predetermined championship sites in South Carolina in response to issues in the state about the prompt display of its Confederate battle flag on the statehouse grounds.

This moratorium extends to other meetings of the Association and could run through the 2003-04 academic year. During this moratorium, the NCAA staff has been directed to undertake a comprehensive review on how criteria approved by the Executive Committee would apply to awarding championship events in South Carolina. Please note that this moratorium does not affect the Executive Committee's decision in April to honor existing contracts for predetermined championships already scheduled in South Carolina.

The Executive Committee also voted to prohibit awarding for the foreseeable future predetermined championship sites in Mississippi, where the Confederate battle flag is incorporated into the state flag. In addition, the championship events awarded to member institutions in South Carolina and Mississippi will continue to be permitted.

I should also note that the Executive Committee's Subcommittee on Gender and Diversity Issues continues to review issues related to the Confederate battle flag and has included in its review those issues related to the use of Native American mascots by NCAA member institutions.

Finally, the Executive Committee has scheduled to receive in April a report from the NCAA Ad Hoc Review Committee, which should provide the Executive Committee with information to help guide the future of the Association and the governance structure.

Last January, the Executive Committee established an ad hoc group of six presidents to oversee a review of the federated governance structure. In addition to conducting personal interviews with all members of the presidential governing bodies, the leadership of the Management Council and the Student-Athletes Advisory Committee, and selected CEOs from all three divisions, the committee distributed a survey to the membership. This ad hoc committee is also evaluating other key issues, including the NCAA core principles, the role of the NCAA staff, the communications between the Association and the membership, and the move of the national office headquarters office to Indianapolis.

After the Executive Committee reviews the report in April, it will be shared with the rest of the governance structure. I am sure you will find the report to be of great interest. I am excited about this opportunity to critically evaluate our own governance structure.

On behalf of my CEO colleagues on the Executive Committee, I want to thank all of you for taking time to complete the survey and to provide the input.

One item of business that we have traditionally conducted during this session is the report of the Memorial Resolutions Committee. The process is a little different this year. At the request of the Memorial Resolutions Committee, each division this fall adopted legislation that eliminated the committee but retained the memorial resolutions report during the opening business session of the annual Convention.

So at this time, Patricia Cormier, chair of the Division II Presidents Council and president of Longwood College, will now present the Memorial Resolutions Committee report.

REPORT OF THE MEMORIAL RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE

Patricia Cormier (Longwood College): Mr. Chair, delegates and guests, at this time, I would like to recognize the work of the Memorial Resolutions Committee and commend the committee for its decision to recommend a more efficient process. It is not often that we find a committee willing to recommend its own elimination.

I also would like to acknowledge the substantial and valuable assistance that we have received from Lori Braa, the NCAA staff member who is assigned the duty of compiling the list that I am about to read.

I ask the delegates, visitors and our friends in the news media to please remain silent during the reading of the following list of those men and women who have passed away since we last met.

The 2001 memorial resolution list of administrator and coaches include:

John W. Atherton, Pomona-Pitzer College
Wilford Bailey, Auburn University
Jean Bell Chandler, Clark Atlanta University
Jamie Benitez, University of Puerto Rico

Lawrence L. Boger, Oklahoma State University
 James Boyce, Eastern Michigan University
 Sam Boyd, Baylor University
 James H. Brickley, Eastern Michigan University
 Bob Burkholder, Muskingum College
 Louis J.P. Calisti, University of Southern Maine
 Francis X. Cretzmeyer, University of Iowa
 Gary Crompton, Weber State University
 Thomas Davenport, University of Virginia
 Allen Dawson, C. W. Post Campus of Long Island
 Brendan Donnelly, Saint Anselm College
 Joe Donovan, State University of College at New Paltz
 Ray Dorr, Texas A&M University
 Joseph C. Duff, U. S. Naval Academy
 Dave Dutton, Shenandoah University
 Jack Elway, Cal State University at Northridge
 Mike English, University of Wyoming
 Peter X. Finnerty, Pace University
 Don Flavin, Northern Illinois University
 Howard W. Fletcher, Northern Illinois University
 Thomas Folliard, Florida Institute of Technology
 Jerry Frei, University of Oregon
 J. Osborn Fuller, Fairleigh Dickinson University
 Stanley Golloway, Southeastern Louisiana University
 Clay Gould, University of Texas at Arlington
 Art Guepe, Vanderbilt University
 Robert Guillot, University of North Alabama
 Arthur Gulden, Bucknell University
 Beverly Hansen, Bentley College
 Thomas Hay, Springfield College
 Jack Horenberger, Illinois Wesleyan University
 George Ireland, Loyola University
 Robert Jordan, Mount Union College
 Tom Kinder, Bridgewater College in Virginia
 John W. Kissel, Hilbert College
 Frances Koeing, Central Michigan University
 Penny Lewis, Lamar University
 Mike Lints, Grand Island State University
 John Lotz, University of Florida
 Howard B. MacAdam, State University of Buffalo
 Lou McCullough, Atlantic Sun Conference
 John McKay, University of Southern California
 Joseph P. McMurray, College of New Rochelle
 Mark McQuillin, University of Louisiana, Lafayette
 Ralph Mirse, University of Columbia, South Carolina
 Yvette Moorehead, George Washington University
 Robert W. Morse, Case Western Reserve University
 John Murphy, Thomas More College

John W. Nason, Carleton College and Swarthmore College
 Davis Paschall, The College of William and Mary
 Paul Pearson, Miami University, Ohio
 Charley Pell, University of Florida
 Nathan M. Pusey, Harvard University and Lawrence University
 Brenda Reilly, Central Connecticut State University
 Rev. Paul C. Reinert, Saint Louis University
 Miller A.F. Ritchie, University of Pacific, Oregon
 William Sharwell, Pace University
 John Stallworth, New Jersey City University
 Jesse N. Stone Jr., Southern University
 Bill Sudeck, Case Western Reserve University
 Jim Tuppeny, University of Pennsylvania
 Jim Verdick, University of Redlands
 Vern Wagner, University of Washington
 Robert Watson, Harvard University
 Ed Weaver, Ohio State University
 David Wells, Claremont-Mudd-Scripps College
 Verl "Jiggs" Westergard, Texas Lutheran College
 Diane Whipple, Saint Mary's College, California
 Jack Wilson, Baylor University
 Vern Wolfe, University of Southern California
 Bob Woodruff, University of Tennessee at Knoxville

The 2001 memorial resolution list of student-athletes:

Eraste Autin, University of Florida
 Bill Berletic, Pace University
 Valerie Cute, Wright State University
 Devaughn Darling, Florida State University
 Gennaro "Jerry" Gambardella, Hofstra University
 JeKelcy Lee Johnson, Alcorn State University
 Jessica Kamp, Illinois College
 Jill Lucas, Tusculum College
 Ty Myers Jr., Neumann College
 Patrick Payton, University of South Florida
 Cole Pittman, University of Texas at Austin
 Conner Senn, Ohio State University
 Andre Took, Georgia State University
 Rashidi Wheeler, Northwestern University
 William Yarocki, C. W. Post Campus of Long Island University

Will you please stand and observe a moment of silence for those who have gone before us. Thank you very much. If you know of persons who should be added to this list, please contact Lori Braa or any member of the NCAA office staff. Thank you.

INTRODUCTION OF PRESIDENT CEDRIC DEMPSEY

Mr. Lawless: Thank you, President Cormier. Now, it is my pleasure to introduce our president, Ced Dempsey. As many of you know,

Ced is always trying to generate ideas and initiatives that improve the lives of our student-athletes and that emphasize the ties between intercollegiate athletics and the educational mission of our member institutions.

Ced continues to identify key issues for the membership to consider, even when the review of these issues may not be the most popular or the easiest choice. It takes a strong and committed individual to be willing to assume the duties that we as the membership and the Executive Committee expect of our president.

Ced has exhibited those qualities throughout his career and continues to do so today. Traditionally, at this time, Ced has presented his State of the Association Address. However, because we have the privilege of hearing Dr. Rice today, his remarks will be more abbreviated.

An expanded version of Ced's remarks, including specific comments on the state of the Association, are available on NCAA online and copies of the full text are available as you leave today.

Ced, we look forward to your remarks. (Applause)

STATE OF THE ASSOCIATION ADDRESS

President Dempsey: Thank you, and good afternoon.

It was a day I'll never forget. I was giving a speech in Atlanta. Near the end of my comments, I looked up and in the back of the room saw a staff member with a concerned look on his face. When I left the stage, I made my way back to him and asked if something was wrong.

His answer was: "Yes, Ced, something is very wrong."

It was September 11, 2001, and our world was changing. September 11th, of course, is one of those days all of us will always remember where we were and what we were doing. And, like me, you'll never forget.

September 11th was one of those moments when good and evil locked in battle, and we immediately understood that good would triumph, as it always does.

By mid-morning of that day, we began to identify the heroes we have celebrated often in the last four months—the firefighters, the police officers, the emergency workers. Ordinary Americans doing the job that they do every day, but doing so under extraordinary circumstances.

We saw other heroes emerge everywhere. We saw a young man help an elderly woman find her husband, who she knew had been close to "Ground Zero." We heard about teams of student-athletes going as a group to give blood because they knew it would be needed.

We read about the heroes aboard United Flight 93—some of them former student-athletes—who rose up against the terrorists and sacrificed themselves so that the plane would not be flown into a second tragedy in our nation's capital.

In the November 19th edition of *The NCAA News*, we told the

story of some former student-athletes who lost their lives that day. One was Michael Weinberg, a former baseball standout at St. John's University. Michael was a New York City firefighter who wasn't supposed to be working on September 11th. He had a day off and was actually going to play golf. But when he heard the news, he threw his clubs in the back of his SUV and raced to lower Manhattan. Michael stopped at his station house to pick up Father Mychal Judge, a fire chaplain, and together they rushed to the scene. Michael was killed and his family believes that Father Judge was administering last rites to Michael when they both were hit by falling debris. They were among the thousands who lost their lives that day.

Julie Geis, a former softball star at the University of Nebraska, and senior vice-president of a Kansas City business firm, was on the 105th floor of the south tower in the World Trade Center when it was struck. Although she perished in the attack, her commitment to helping others lives on in Kansas City. An active volunteer, Julie was president of an organization called "Women With One Voice," a non-profit group that assists women and their families in need of medical services, health care and educational assistance.

Todd Beamer, another former baseball student-athlete at Wheaton College in Illinois, was on United Flight 93. Now we know of the heroic actions Todd and some fellow passengers took. Flight 93 will forever be a symbol of those who refuse to let evil have its way.

In fact, it was Todd's last words into his cell phone that President Bush recently cited as a rallying cry for America. Todd said: "Are you guys ready? Let's roll."

Through all the numbing disbelief of September 11, we have seen Americans in the free world rally behind a nation and a President determined to fight back, determined to overcome adversity the likes of which we have not seen for generations in this country.

Since that day, each of us has looked within ourselves for values, principles and character to sustain the war effort that we know will go on for some time. Those of us fortunate enough to have been involved in athletics have much to draw from, and September 11th reminded us to protect those values, not only for our own needs but for those of future generations.

Tonight, we will honor 15 very special individuals at the NCAA Honors Dinner. We will celebrate the accomplishments of Today's Top VIII, the six Silver Anniversary winners and the winner of the Theodore Roosevelt Award. These 15 individuals truly represent the great promise of intercollegiate athletics.

For the Teddy winner and the Silver Anniversary winners, it is the promise fulfilled, that intercollegiate athletics can produce greatness on the field and in society as a whole. For Today's Top VIII, it is the promise for tomorrow. Here is where leaders are made.

We visited recently with three of the Silver Anniversary winners to ask them about the values they took from their days as student-athletes, how those values helped them develop professionally and

personally over the last 25 years, and how those values helped sustain these remarkable individuals in the days after September 11.

Richard Chapman is the president and CEO of Clark/Bardes Consulting, the world's largest compensation and benefits consulting firm. He was a basketball standout and academic all-American when he led Augustana College to the NCAA Division II tournament in 1977. He lost both friends and business associates in the attacks on the World Trade Center. Rich talks about learning to bounce back from adversity: "When I was an athlete, virtually on a daily basis, there were things to bounce back from. Something as small as a bad practice, or a poor game, even a bad season. It was necessary to have a positive attitude, to dig a little deeper, come back and correct things that were wrong, perhaps, or even events that happened outside of my control."

"I find that in our business setting, those are issues that we deal with every day. It could be a reversal on an economic trend that is outside of our control. It could be business issues that we make mistakes and we need to correct. But we need to bounce back, we need to overcome, we need to have a positive attitude so that we can move on to the next level, to a new plateau of success in our business environment."

Betsy King, the first player in the Ladies Professional Golf Association to reach the \$6 million career earnings mark, was inducted into the LPGA Hall of Fame in 1996. She also was a three-year letter winner in basketball at Furman and helped lead the school to an AIAW golf championship in 1976. Betsy talks about the need for discipline to help bring balance to our lives. She sees September 11 as a loss of innocence.

"I think one of the things that collegiate sports taught me was discipline, because it was tough to be a student-athlete. You really have to learn how to balance your time, make good use of your time, and have the discipline to study as well as to practice your particular sport. And certainly, what's helped me, I think, on the LPGA Tour, is to be disciplined because there is a lot of things that you have to do besides just play golf. And the organization, the discipline that I learned in college was very helpful."

Rodney Slater was Secretary of Transportation under President Clinton and was the first African-American to head the Federal Highway Administration. At Eastern Michigan University, he was a three-year letterman in football. For Rodney, athletics represented family, and he has carried that sense of family throughout his career. Now a lawyer in Washington, D.C., Rodney also lost friends and colleagues in the World Trade Center attacks.

"Well, for me, moving away from a little, small town in Arkansas to Eastern Michigan, really, with the student population five times larger than my hometown population, I felt a bit like someone going to a distant land such as the football team and then later the forensics team and the entire university 'family' as I refer to it, became my

extended family. The kind of love that encourages you to do your best, that encourages you to stay focused and to muster the resolve necessary to not only win on the athletics field but to win in life as well. And that spirit has been with me across the years, all of the friendships and the love enjoyed and the experiences that I will cherish for a lifetime."

Perseverance, discipline, family—those are values with which each of us can identify.

It seems to me that the critical lesson for us to take from these commentaries is the importance of the student-athlete experience. We spend so much time and energy in the governance of intercollegiate athletics over recruiting advantages and disadvantages, over competitive equity and level playing field, and over marketing to maximize our revenues. But if addressing those issues is all we believe our mission is, we are selling ourselves and our student-athletes far short.

Among the many lessons created by the September 11th attacks is the very real one that we will defeat evil by the efforts—heroic, extraordinary or common—of people bolstered by the values that sustain them through their darkest hours. I believe that intercollegiate athletics has been and will continue to be a significant way to impart those values.

The educational experience of the student-athlete, in the classroom and on the field or court, is paramount. Our primary mission is to educate so that we can produce "the right stuff" in those who will lead us tomorrow. We have to instill the values of perseverance, discipline and family so that the next generation is prepared for whatever may come.

It would be easy to go from here today, imbued in the rhetoric of values, to leave the Honors Dinner tonight, inspired with the achievements of the best and brightest, and to return tomorrow to a version of business-as-usual that fails to apply these lessons to our real world. I encourage you not to do so.

Our publics believe us when we say our priority should be the support of student-athletes, but they also believe that we are paying more attention to making money than educating young people. We know that because we have done the research. The media, the general public and even those of us involved in the administration of college sports have all said that the NCAA and intercollegiate athletics give real service to raising revenues and lip service to supporting the best interests of student-athletes.

That is a significant part of our reputation today, and if we are going to change that reputation, we are going to have to change what business-as-usual looks like.

Earlier this year, the Knight Commission issued its report after months of interviews and discussion. I was a member of that commission, and there are portions of the report I agree with and portions I certainly don't. I have publicly said that I think it painted with

too broad and too dark a brush. I know many of you feel the same way, and we could debate the findings and recommendations all day.

But there are two undeniable facts that emerge from the report. First, there are significant portions of those publics we rely on for support and who have put their trust in us to conduct intercollegiate athletics in accordance with the values we espouse. These publics believe we are failing in that effort.

In other words, there are "trust gaps" between those who run intercollegiate athletics and the media, the public, the faculty at our own institutions, and the student-athletes who participate in college sports. While our "approval rating," to borrow a term from politics, within each of our communities is probably high, the collective perception of college sports should be of concern to us.

The second undeniable fact that came out of the Knight Commission report is that we must find "the will to act." We cannot afford to indulge our local self-interest while we continue to damage the reputation of college sports as a whole.

If we are to regain the public's confidence that we live by the values we speak, we will have to overcome our instincts for more wins, more money, more control and more power when those instincts interfere with the mission of the academies to which we owe our allegiance. That is a challenge for our enterprise driven by competitive impulse. But I believe we can do it, and indeed we must do it.

If I could create a road map for the reform in intercollegiate athletics that many in the last year have called for, I would create an environment in which we measure every proposed legislation or policy change against the values we say are important. That's the real test of how we honor values. How do we put them to use every day, good times and bad, on the field or off, even when no one is looking?

I like the models for organizational behavior that Divisions II and III have established through their strategic planning process, which aligns decision-making with values. The governance bodies within each of those divisions recognized some four years ago that they needed a new model for directing what I have today called "business-as-usual." They recognized the need to reaffirm the values they already had in their philosophy statements, create specific goals based on issues confronting each division, and then filter proposed legislation through those values and goals.

The role of the Management and Presidents Councils in those divisions is to set the agenda, focus proposed legislation towards the goals and values and then hold the membership accountable for aligning decisions with values.

A year ago, I commended Division II for the work it had done with regard to redefining amateurism. To focus on that very thorny issue, the Management and Presidents Councils made amateurism one of the division's 10 goals in 1998. A committee had worked through the problem, examined the issue under the light of the Division II philosophy statement and put a set of proposals before the membership

that represented the first real change in amateurism since athletics were brought to America.

Division III has a set of proposals on amateurism to consider this year. The proposals are somewhat different from those approved last year by Division II because the operating philosophies of the two divisions are different. And that, of course, is as it should be.

Both, however, embrace student-athlete welfare in ways that are meaningful and that align business-as-usual with values.

I encourage Division III to approve Proposals 41 through 45 that make up the amateurism deregulation package. I also encourage Division III to continue on a path to establish financial aid audits by peer groups. This will assure compliance with the fundamental principle that excludes athletic ability from consideration when determining financial assistance.

This is an important example to Division III of how we must hold ourselves accountable for the values we embrace. Division II is once again breaking new ground with its efforts to better define the role and duties of the senior woman administrator position. We look forward to reviewing the results of that effort.

Division I is at the front end of its strategic-planning process, but the job is well underway. A Board of Directors task force was created in August to focus on academic and fiscal integrity issues. That group is guiding a baseline study of economic and other factors that drive the behavior of Division I member institutions and student-athletes. It also is re-examining the vision, mission and guiding principles for Division I to help develop the division's strategic plan.

Another Division I group that is focusing on how to align business-as-usual with values is the Football Study Oversight Committee. It also is a presidential-driven body that is examining a broad range of issues around Division I football.

A third Division I group is taking a look at academic integrity issues and developing proposals for an integrated set of initial- and continuing-eligibility standards. They seek standards that will redefine academic progress so that graduation rates are improved and Division I can deliver on the promise to educate the student-athletes it recruits.

The Division I members will hear reports from all three of those groups tomorrow in the forum. Much work remains to be done in Division I. We can't let up in our efforts to increase ethnic and gender diversity among head coaches and administrators, to comply with Title IX, to assure that the integrity of athletics programs and higher education is not impaired by outside influences, to reduce the time demands on student-athletes.

But the will to act appears to be at the forefront in the work of the task force. As Kent State President Carol Cartwright, a member of the Division I Board and task force said: "We need to create a reputation for the Board so that no one will dare bring us a proposal that doesn't match up with our values."

The reputation of intercollegiate athletics must continue to be based on values, and devotion to education, the primacy of the student-athlete, and the expectation for fair, equitable and sportsman-like competition must be paramount among those values. We must embrace value-based decision-making as a new business model. To help guide us, we cannot forget the lessons of the last 120 days.

After his death, Todd Beamer's wife found a folded piece of paper in her husband's den. It was important to Todd and it should be important to us. Todd had saved a message from a speech Theodore Roosevelt gave in 1910, entitled: "Citizenship in a Republic."

The passage reads: "The credit belongs to the man who is actually in the arena—who strives valiantly, who knows the great enthusiasms, the great devotions, and spends himself in worthy causes. Who, at best, knows the triumph of high achievement and who, at worst, if he fails, fails while daring greatly so that his place shall never be with those cold and timid souls who know neither victory nor defeat."

Today, as it has always been, our challenge is clear. Athletics must teach. We must use those games not simply as a contest but as a classroom for life, to strive, and to live for much more than the transitory win or loss.

An enormous price was paid September 11th for the reminder that this nation has its roots in values. We guard against another September 11th by living and protecting those values, never taking them for granted, always remembering the sacrifices that come with such action.

Finally, we must remember that each of us has a role to play in teaching the next generation that values are the foundation of our society and ultimately of our lives.

None of us can ever forget. As we rebuild and restore our nation and ourselves, we cannot and must not forget. The values we fight to preserve, the examples we set with our lives, and the contributions we make to our communities form the bedrock of this great nation. Thank you. (Applause)

INTRODUCTION OF KEYNOTE SPEAKER

President Dempsey: It is my distinct pleasure and honor to introduce today's keynote speaker, Dr. Condoleezza Rice. She is recognized across the nation and around the world today as the National Security Advisor to President George W. Bush. But she would also be recognized in the halls of academia.

In 1999, she completed a six-year tenure as provost at Stanford University, where she was responsible for a \$1.5 billion annual budget and an academic program involving 1,400 faculty and 14,000 students. Dr. Rice is a professor on leave of political science at Stanford where she has been a faculty member since 1981. During that time, she won two of the highest teaching honors—the 1984 Walter J. Gore's Award for Excellence in Teaching, and in 1993, the School of

Humanities and Sciences Dean's Award for Distinguished Teaching.

Her current role isn't the first assignment Dr. Rice has had in a Bush administration. From 1989 through March 1991, the period of German reunification and the final days of the Soviet Union, she served in the first Bush administration as director and then senior director of Soviet and East European Affairs in the National Security Council, and a Special Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs.

An extraordinarily high-profile job under any circumstances, the role and importance of the presence of the National Security Advisor is even more critical since the events of September 11th.

Dr. Rice, as much as we would have been honored with your in-person presentation, you bring the added drama of speaking to us directly from the White House.

Ladies and gentlemen, Dr. Condoleezza Rice. (Applause)

KEYNOTE SPEAKER — CONDOLEEZA RICE

Ms. Rice: Thank you very much. Thank you, Ced, and thank you very much to the NCAA for this opportunity to be with you. I am sorry that I can't be with you in person, but I am very glad to have a chance to share a message with my friends and colleagues at the NCAA.

I am a great fan of intercollegiate athletics. In fact, during my time as Stanford's provost, I had the great pleasure of having athletics report to me and working with the athletics program there. I am a big fan because I was supposed to be my father's all-American linebacker. I am the only child and he was a football coach. It didn't quite work out that way, but it has given me something to love and to have a passion for all my life.

September 11th was a watershed event in American history. It was a time that changed all of us and changed all of us for good. Every single member will remember what they were doing at 8:45 on September 11th. I, for one, was standing in my west wing office in the White House.

I was just about to go down to a staff meeting to meet with my senior staff member and get the day started. The President was in Florida. When I saw that the first plane had hit the World Trade Center, I got in touch with him and I said: "Mr. President, a plane has hit the World Trade Center." "Was the plane an accident?" A few minutes later, during the staff meeting, I learned that a second plane had hit the World Trade Center, and I suddenly knew that America had been a victim of a terrorist attack.

Ever since that day, it has been the best of times and the worst of times. It has been the worst of time because of the great sacrifice of life, the great sacrifice of the people who gave their lives to save others, the brave people aboard flights that wrestled planes to the ground rather than let them further attack Washington, D.C.

Families have been changed forever. Our country has been

changed forever by those sacrifices. It has also been the worst of times because we have had to come to terms with our vulnerability of a country as a democracy. We are a very open society and we need to remain an open society, but we have learned that in our openness there were those who came into this country especially to hurt us, and they succeeded.

On the other hand, it has been an extraordinary time for Americans to awaken to who they are and who we are as a country. I can tell you that I am quite certain that the terrorists, when they attacked this country, believed that we would not respond favorably.

They believed that we had become soft and they believed that our tremendous diversity, the happy voices that is characteristic of democracy, the fact that we argued and fought about the least little issue in politics, that somehow we were brittle and weak. What they learned instead is that this country is strong. The fabric of this society cannot be broken with a terrorist attack. The world learned something about America. It learned that that strength could be translated into a call for all of those who love freedom and all of those who love civilization to unite against this evil that is terrorism.

And we learned something about ourselves. We learned that it really does not matter where we came from or who we were on that day, we were all Americans. All of our hyphenations and such that we have engaged over the last several years—African-Americans, Mexican-Americans and Italian-Americans—simply become just Americans.

We learned, too, that the core of being an American is because we share values, and it is values that unite us, not some false creed, but an understanding equal within us that came full force of what it means to be an American. I believe that this is the time when we need to focus on what we must do to make ourselves less vulnerable.

Indeed, the President has a very important program underway at home and abroad to make certain that we are less vulnerable. In the war against terrorism, we are making tremendous progress. We set out three goals in the war on terrorism.

First and foremost, to destroy the al-Qaeda network and other terrorist networks of global reach that would try and bring about the kind of events that they did on September 11th. This is not an easy job. It is a shadowy enemy that hides in caves.

But I want to report to you today that the shadowy enemies that have vanished to 60 different countries is on the run. We have not yet defeated this terrorist network, but the United States of America is determined however long it takes, whatever it takes, whatever sacrifice it takes, we will destroy the terrorist networks that hurt us so badly, and with their own devices hurt others as well.

The United States has also sent a strong message that you cannot sponsor and harbor terrorists and expect us to leave you alone. The Taliban regime brutally repressed the people of Afghanistan and allowed the foreign al-Qaeda to use assets for terrorism.

The Taliban, which once controlled the country, now rules no more than a few caves. But we have a lot of other work to do in Afghanistan. We have to continue to move out this terrorist network and we have to move out in other places where it might try to regenerate and where it might find another platform for its terrorist acts.

That work is underway as well. We have work to do to make certain that Afghanistan is stable. Afghanistan's history is a sad one for its own people and for its neighbors. It has been a source of instability and problems for its neighbors for many, many years.

But I can tell you that as the American armed forces and our allies liberated Afghanistan, the people of Afghanistan are beginning to feel the first vestiges of freedom. Women threw off their turbans. Women who just several years ago were allowed to become doctors now are happy to put their girls in school for the first time.

It is great to see an interim authority in Afghanistan toiling and laboring to try to come to terms with the need for a broadly based multi-ethnic government in Afghanistan. It is wonderful to see Afghanistan taking hold of its own future.

The international community will have a responsibility to support that work, and we will do that. We also are working to make ourselves less vulnerable at home. The President, through the appointment of Office of Homeland Security Director Tom Ridge, has focused a new spotlight on all the things we must do to regain an open society and at the same time be one that is less vulnerable, whether it is the security of our ports, of our airports, or simply an understanding of the American people—as demonstrated recently on an American Airlines flight—that security is also each and every one of our responsibilities to make certain that we are vigilant and watchful.

That is the job we all must do to deal with the threats of terrorism. But there is also a job to make certain that we reinforce the values that brought us together on that day and the values that unite us as Americans. It is in that regard that I am especially happy to address the NCAA, because one of the most important values that we share as Americans is a value that says it really doesn't matter where you came from, it matters where you are going. And the key to that is education. It is education that is the great equalizer in America of circumstances and of people.

I had a grandfather who is a real hero to me, because he understood the value of education. Back in 1918 or 1919, my grandfather, a sharecropper's son down in Ewtah, that is E-w-t-a-h, Alabama, decided for some reason that he wanted to get book learning. So he asked people who came by how could he go to college? They explained to him that there was a little college called Stillman College right down the road in Tuscaloosa, and if he got there he could probably go to college. So, he saved up his cotton and he went off to college. He paid his first year's tuition with cotton. Then came the second year. He didn't have any more cotton. They said: "Well, you know, if you can't pay, you are going to have to leave."

So he looked around and he said: "Well, how are these other boys going to school?" They said: "Well, some of them have what is called a scholarship. If you want to be a Presbyterian minister, then you can have a scholarship, too." My grandfather said: "You know, that is exactly what I had in mind." (Laughter)

My family has been Presbyterian and college educated ever since. (Applause)

Granddaddy understood that a college education is the ticket—the ticket to make yourself anew and to strive to be whatever you can be. I believe that we as college educators, and the NCAA in particular, have a special responsibility in this regard, because opportunities are provided to those who might not otherwise have a college education.

Let's say just for a minute what a college education does for you. Of course, it is a ticket to be successful in America, but it is also a ticket to find yourself. I give a speech to the Stanford freshmen each year in which I tell them I just want them to remember three things while in college. By the way, thanks to Stanford's athletic director, Ted Leland, I gave the same speech to a few recruiting classes as well. That speech was something like the following: While you are in college, just make sure you find your passion. Not just finding a career or a job, it is finding what makes you want to get up in the morning.

I went to college and my passion was to be a great concert pianist. I could read music before I could read. When I was 3-years-old, I started to play the piano. There was no doubt in my mind that I was going to play in Carnegie Hall. There was only one problem. I lacked judicious talent; and there was a second problem, I hated to practice. The combination convinced me that I was going to end up teaching 13-year-olds to learn Beethoven or playing a piano in a bar, or playing in an orchestra instead. So, I decided to find something else.

I found the Soviet Union in a class. I went on from there to become Special Assistant to President Bush for Soviet European Affairs and eventually National Security Advisor. I wouldn't have done it had I not found a passion. I hope that with every student you encounter, whether an athlete or not, you tell that student to find his or her passion, because that is what sustains you in life.

Secondly, it is really important to get college students to do something harder, to challenge themselves, not to take the easy way out. In some ways, athletes should be the people best suited to do this, because I can tell you as a former not-very-good athlete myself, that athletics teaches you that you can get up the next day even if you have had a bad competition, even if you have had a bad practice, you can get up and you can keep going.

So you learn that to fail temporarily at something is not to fail forever. We need to tell our kids that doing something hard and succeeding is in many ways more fulfilling than doing something that you are very, very good at doing. I was a figure skater, and I learned

many, many times in competition that I wasn't really all that good, but I worked very hard at it.

The discipline and the hard work and the perseverance and the getting up the next day has served me well throughout my life. Finally, a college education creates an entirely new family for you. The people whom you know, the people with whom you go to college in many ways are some of the most important friendships of your life.

Of course, in college athletics, that experience is amplified. The ability to know people from all walks of life and to have in common with them that you are now a college graduate, or that you are members of the same team. It is a wonderful, democratic experience, because at a place like Stanford, and I am sure at the universities represented in that hall tonight, you learn that you may stand in front of the class with one student who is the third- or fourth- generation legacy of the university, but a student sitting next to that student may be the first in his family to have gone to college.

He may have been an immigrant worker's child or the child of a worker who never thought or dreamed of going to college himself, but wanted to make sure that his child got the upper hand. So the friends that you make are not just friends because you suffered through classes together and the growing experience together, or in the case of athletes the playing experience together.

They are friends because you come together in a very American way bringing differences of circumstance, bringing differences of geography, bringing differences of temperament to find what is common. Yes, it has been an extraordinary time for America, good and bad, but if we all stay focused on what it is that makes this country what it is, we will most certainly get through the trying and difficult times ahead, and there will be some.

As you talk to your students, as you talk to those to whom you have a special responsibility, remind them that it is the challenge of this generation and that it is great to have the opportunity to renew again America's values. Thank you very much. (Applause)

Mr. Lawless: Thank you, Dr. Rice. I think you can tell by the extended ovation how pleased we are to have you with us today. On behalf of the entire Association, I would like to thank you for taking time out of what must be an incredibly hectic and busy schedule to participate in our Convention.

We were excited about the opportunity to have you here in person, but we understand the time constraints and demands that prevented you from traveling to Indianapolis. We are pleased that you are still able to spend a little time with us to discuss these important issues.

It is now time for us to take questions from the membership for Dr. Rice. Please stand up and go to the nearest microphone, and I will call upon you by microphone number. Please remember to state your name and your institutional affiliation.

Patricia Cormier (Longwood College): Dr. Rice, thank you very

much. I think that was an incredible presentation. I don't think we could express our words just what kind of impact it had on us. I have a question for you. I understand that there are only a couple of hundred books left in Afghanistan.

What kinds of provisions are being made now by the United States government for truly trying to implement an educational program there? I know that things are fairly devastated. Do we have a plan of action for how we are going to help them rebuild this whole educational enterprise?

Dr. Rice: That is a very good question. Indeed, we will pay a great amount of attention to the educational system of Afghanistan. It was completely devastated by the Taliban, which had a very strange notion of education, which was really their own propaganda.

We intend to work with other countries and also with the United Nations. The United Nations has a number of developing agencies that will be actively engaged in Afghanistan. In fact, there will be a conference this coming week at which Secretaries Powell and O'Neill of the Treasury are going to Tokyo to talk about the task of rebuilding Afghanistan. Clearly, education is right at the top of the ladder.

We are particularly interested in the education of women, because that was the most devastating impact that the Taliban had. It was impossible for young girls, fifth grade or older, to even study. You make a very important point, and the Tokyo conference has humongous charges to do something about the educational system of Afghanistan.

Let me just encourage universities as well to think what each university might be able to do, what associations of universities might be able to do for the people of Afghanistan. There is probably no more important program after World War II than the Marshall and Fulbright Scholarships that brought Europeans to this country to study.

We all have in our universities exchange programs. We all have opportunities for foreign students to study. We all ought to be thinking about the reintegration of the Afghan people into the world educational community.

Esther Barazzone (Chatham College): Dr. Rice, in what ways do you think American colleges and universities might work through our curricula to reinforce those values of democracy in our nation?

Students are happy to volunteer, but won't vote. Are there responsibilities that we have where we could express ways that we could change this?

Dr. Rice: I do think there are ways that curricula could contribute. First of all, I am a very big fan of teaching history. We don't teach enough history. I am afraid that our students don't have the historical perspective on how unique the American experience is.

We are doing better in our universities in teaching the broad experiences of all Americans, but for a long time, the whole culture was left out of the teaching. We are doing better in that regard. I real-

ly mean teaching history in a way that talks about the importance of the enlightenment in Western culture, that talks about the importance of the democratic values that are embodied in our Constitution and the Declaration of Independence, that talks about the father of all, the Magna Carta.

Our kids need to understand where these values came from and how they can be nurtured. I think our curricula can also help our students understand something that is very special about democracy and our democracy in particular. That is, that tolerance doesn't come from just somehow tolerating each other, or tolerating other ethnic groups, it comes from understanding that we have a common future, that we have common values.

So when we teach about our tremendous multi-ethnic society, we need to ground it very much in that which unites us and not that which divides us. I think there is a lot of work that can be done in the curricula.

Tim Floyd (Hendrix College): Hello, Dr. Rice. I have two questions, one you have already answered partially. Al-Qaeda is just one of the many terrorist groups that have national networks. We have it in Unin, in Somalia, in the Philippines. There are training camps in the Philippines.

Also, the issue is always looming there of some of the same—the fact that the Unin observers have not been in that country for three years or more. How is it that we can as educators continue to teach our students that this is not something that is going to be solved just simply by eradicating al-Qaeda and the al-Qaeda network, but that this has to be a prolonged process, and perhaps the issues are the same, and it will be the biggest challenge? How do we continue to encourage them to think in terms of perseverance and in terms of this being a long-term commitment?

Dr. Rice: Thank you very much for that question. It is one of the most difficult challenges we are going to have, because Americans like instant gratification. We are not going to have it this time. It is going to take time to do this right.

President Bush has talked about the years that we are all going to have to be devoted to rooting out terrorism. Even when we have rooted out al-Qaeda, we will not have done the job against rooting out terrorism. It is a slow job of closing down their training camps in some of the countries that you mentioned.

In some places, we will certainly not have to use military power because we will have the cooperation of governments in doing it. This is a matter for intelligence and law enforcement cooperation with many countries in the world.

Al-Qaeda is in 60 different countries around the world, and there are other global terrorist networks in many more countries. It is going to take maximum cooperation and intelligence and law enforcement to root them out. By the way, rooting out al-Qaeda cells here in the United States is an extremely important part of their job as well.

Then we have to cut off their financial network. You may have noticed that we have been announcing several times here the freezing of assets, the closing down of organizations that might sound good on the surface, might even sound like humanitarian organizations on the surface, but really are just fronts for terrorist financing.

We do have a long and tough job ahead of us. I know we have to count on the American people. So far, we all have lived up to the kind of patience to do the job right. It is very interesting. One of our generals, General Tommy Franks, said something in a meeting not too long ago.

He said: "You know, it may be a little bit like baseball rather than football." As he put it, it will be a lot of sitting there punctuated by an occasional rush of adrenaline. I think we have to get used to that. If you could tell your students that doing this right is more important than doing it quickly, you will be delivering an extremely important message for this country and for the world.

The government is prepared to be patient. We are prepared to do what it takes for however long it takes, but the American people will then have to stay with us. It will not always look as if it is going fairly well. It will not always look as if something is happening, but a lot is happening, and it is extremely important for us to take the time to do it well.

Mr. Lawless: Our satellite time will allow us time for one final question.

Unidentified Delegate: Dr. Rice, all of us here are involved in athletics, and many in and out of the classroom labor with the responsibility of educating our students through the discipline of competition.

Do you have a vision of how we in athletics can help our country in education in Afghanistan?

Dr. Rice: I believe that Afghanistan is going to have to be re-integrated. I believe the university can play a very important role in that. Our students, all of them, are going to have to take what they learn in college and take what they have learned in their lives, take what they have learned on the playing field and recognize that we as Americans are both very much responsible for what goes on in the world and are very much affected by it.

I hope that if we have learned anything from September 11th, it is the spirit of isolation is not ours to have. So, the messages that we give our students about what their lives are going to be like, there has to be a message about an international dimension to that.

The universities are marvelously multi-ethnic places these days. They are also marvelously multi-international places. There are students from all over the world in most universities. That is a very good lesson, one that we intend to continue.

We believe that the student's experience that crosses these areas and crosses these borders is an extremely important one for us as Americans and for the rest of the world as well.

Mr. Lawless: Unfortunately, that is all the time we have today to share with Dr. Rice. The past four months really have been a challenging time for our nation, and we appreciate the insight you have given us today.

Dr. Rice, we want to thank you again for your time, your comments and all that you have done and you are doing for our country. (Applause)

Dr. Rice: Thank you very much.

Mr. Lawless: We also would like to thank Ced for his insightful comments, which always provide us with issues, challenges and directions.

Ced, thank you. (Applause)

At the start of today's session, I mentioned those individuals who have been providing leadership in the three divisions during the past year. We are fortunate that Brit Kirwan and Patricia Cormier will continue to serve as chairs in Divisions I and II for another year.

Division III will have a new chair in 2002, and I would like to take this opportunity to commend Tom Courtice for the leadership he has provided in Division III and the real difference that he makes. You may not understand how much difference he makes on the Executive Committee. I would like for all of us to show Tom by our applause how much we appreciate what he has done for the entire Association. (Applause)

Please don't forget that we have our Honors Dinner tonight, which will be at 7:30 in the Sagamore Ballroom in the Convention Center. Please be reminded that tickets for this year's event will be collected at the door and you will need a ticket to attend this event.

Also, please refer to the Convention schedule for details regarding your divisional business sessions and the forums that we will have. Ladies and gentlemen, thank you for your attention today, thank you for your attendance at the Convention and your time in Indianapolis, the home of the NCAA. This session is adjourned.

[The opening business session was adjourned at 5:45 p.m.]

■ NCAA Honors Dinner

Sunday Evening, January 13, 2002

[The 2002 NCAA Honors Dinner was called to order by Bob Lawless, president of the University of Tulsa, at 7:30 p.m.]

OPENING COMMENTS

Mr. Lawless: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. Tonight, I welcome each of you to the 37th annual NCAA Honors Dinner, where we celebrate the lives of each of the honorees with whom I share the stage this evening.

We will begin with an invocation by John Galgano, a Division III Student-Athlete Advisory Committee member and Management Council Representative, and former member of the Manhattanville College baseball team. Please remain seated during the invocation.

INVOCATION

John Galgano (Division III Student-Athlete Advisory Committee): It must often be so, when things are in danger, someone has to give them up, lose them, so that others may keep them.

May our faith in each other and our faith in the power, joy and wonder of the accomplishments of student-athletes lead us to new heights of appreciation for those who have given the ultimate sacrifice so that we may celebrate here tonight.

This year has been one of heroes, and tonight we celebrate some of our own. These heroes seated here remind us that, at its best, inter-collegiate athletics can help bind the wounds of broken lives and broken faith.

These remarkable individuals have given us joy when there was hurt and wonder when there was no hope. For this reason, we celebrate tonight the accomplishments of these special former and current student-athletes and ask for the gift of faith that we may never take for granted the heroes who have given up their lives so that we might share in this joy.

We give thanks for the many blessings we have received this year, and most of all, we give thanks for the gift of being together here tonight.

Mr. Lawless: Thank you, John. Please enjoy your dinner and your dinner companions at your tables. We will soon be back to honor tonight's special guests.

[Dinner was served.]

PRESENTATION OF PLAQUE TO JUDITH SWEET

Mr. Lawless: Tonight, we have joined together to celebrate NCAA athletics and the student-athletes who put their heart and soul into their sports, their studies and into their communities. As you look at Today's Top VIII Award winners, you can't help but notice the tremendous influence of women's sports. Six of the top eight are female student-athletes. These young women were just toddlers when women's championships were first embraced by the NCAA 20 years ago.

In recognition of the 20th anniversary of women's championships, I would like to present this commemorative plaque marking this momentous occasion to a very special person. Her vision helped make the experience of NCAA championships become a reality for thousands of female student-athletes.

Ladies and gentlemen, Judith Sweet, NCAA senior woman administrator and vice-president for championships. (Applause)

RESPONSE BY JUDITH SWEET

Ms. Sweet: Thank you, Dr. Lawless, and I thank you. Good evening, everyone. Tonight, almost 2,000 of us gather together to celebrate the accomplishments of these amazing honorees. We also have the opportunity to reflect on the changes that have occurred for female student-athletes since the passage of Title IX 30 years ago and the initiation of NCAA women's championships 20 years ago.

As director of athletics at UC San Diego in 1981, I had the privilege to attend the very first NCAA Division III Women's Volleyball Championship held at Maryville College in Maryville, Tennessee. It was a thrill for the Triton team to be making history as the first participants in an NCAA volleyball championship and to compete before a crowd of approximately 100 spectators—primarily family, friends and other competing teams.

Five years later, the crowd surpassed 3,000 at Calvin College, and I can only imagine the excitement of the participants in the 2001 championship last December at the University of Wisconsin, Whitewater, as they competed before a full-house, standing room only crowd, while many disappointed fans had to be turned away.

To verify my sentiments at that first national championship, I would like to make a donation to the already fabulous Hall of Champions, where this plaque will appear. This is a mint condition T-shirt from the very first Division III Women's Volleyball Championship in Maryville College. (Applause) And for those of you who might be doing math, I was 19 at the time. (Laughter)

When the first female student-athlete was awarded an NCAA championship medal in 1980, it was for the sport of rifle. A woman by

the name of Elaine Proffitt was part of the combined Tennessee Technological University men's and women's championship team. Although she was part of a national winning team, the news reports the next day failed to mention her name as part of the team. Now, fast forward to the 2001 Women's Final Four. For the ninth consecutive year, the tournament was a complete sellout, with more than 20,000 fans attending. What a difference 20 years of increased opportunities, funding, promotions and support can make. Close to 600 media credentials were issued for the tournament and you can bet the names of those female student-athletes were included in the news articles.

While success isn't necessarily measured by media exposure, it does represent the significant increased interest in women's athletics and the publicity that exposes young girls and boys to women's sports and provides them with positive role models.

In 1981, there were a little more than 64,000 female student-athletes competing in NCAA sports. In 20 short years, the number of female student-athletes competing at the NCAA level has grown to more than 145,000. Thanks to the men and women who 20 years ago had the vision and understood the importance of women's athletics, women now compete for 43 championships in 19 sports, with rowing and ice hockey being the latest events.

Tournament fields in women's athletics have grown from 314 to 903 teams in Divisions I, II and III. Twenty years is certainly a milestone for women's championships. We have come so far and touched the lives of so many young women; dreams for so many have become reality. And it is with eager anticipation that we can look forward to the new opportunities and accomplishments we might be celebrating during our golden anniversary. Thank you.

Audiovisual Message: What a difference 20 years can make. Twenty years ago, women's intercollegiate athletics were in their infancy. A magazine devoted to women's sports was nearly impossible to find on a newsstand, and a young boy wearing a jersey with a woman's name on the back was unheard of.

But 20 years ago, the NCAA opened a new door for women in intercollegiate athletics when it began to sponsor women's championships. Since then, an incredible number of opportunities have opened up to women. The NCAA now offers female student-athletes the opportunity to compete in 43 championships in 19 sports, and more than 150,000 young women participate annually in NCAA intercollegiate athletics.

In 1982, a souvenir program for the finals of the women's basketball championship was \$2.50, and 9,531 seats were sold for the final game between Louisiana Tech University and Cheney

University of Pennsylvania.

In 2001, the Women's Final Four drew a sellout crowd of 20,551 in St. Louis, the ninth consecutive sellout in Women's Final Four history. Almost 600 media credentials were issued, and fans paid \$100 a seat and \$10.50 for a program.

It certainly has been an incredible 20 years of growth in interest and opportunities. With the expanded television coverage of multiple women's sports events, young girls now know that dreams can become reality as they enjoy the excitement and benefits associated with sports.

The first 20 years of women's NCAA championships are a strong indication of the positive impact opportunity can have on the lives of so many. The door is open for a future that will provide for many more milestones and celebrations. Women's championships and women's athletics are here to stay. They are a vital, vibrant part of our culture. (Applause)

Mr. Lawless: Judy, thank you again for all your efforts on behalf of women's athletics. I hope the plaque will be a visual reminder of all that has been accomplished over the last two decades.

Tonight, we will honor 17 individuals who have made outstanding contributions to collegiate athletics. It is in their spirit of athleticism that they share a common bond. And it is that spirit that does not limit their victories to just the playing field.

It is their triumphs in the community arena that sets these individuals apart. We will honor newly graduated or senior student-athletes with the Today's Top VIII Awards. We will then introduce to you former student-athletes who continue to promote athleticism through their civic and professional lives. Also tonight, we will award the NCAA Inspiration Award for the first time. The Inspiration Award is presented tonight to two incredible people who were faced with life-changing situations. Their stories are ones of hope and indeed inspiration.

Finally, we will have the honor of meeting the 35th recipient of the NCAA Theodore Roosevelt Award.

But before we begin, I would like to introduce a man who has dedicated his career to collegiate athletics and serves today at the helm of the National Collegiate Athletic Association. Please join me in welcoming the president of the NCAA, Cedric Dempsey.

I would also like to introduce to you the NCAA Honors Committee members who have the almost impossible task of selecting tonight's honorees and planning tonight's program. Will each of you remain standing until I have named all the committee members so that we can applaud your efforts simultaneously: Valerie Richardson, chair and assistant commissioner, West Coast

Conference; Harry Carson, president, Harry Carson, Incorporated; Gene Corrigan, commissioner-emeritus, Atlantic Coast Conference; Joseph Crowley, regent's professor and president emeritus, University of Nevada; Clyde Doughty Jr., athletics director, New York Institute of Technology; Jack Ford, ABC News; Jo Ann Harper, senior associate athletics director, Dartmouth College; and Karen Johnson, director of institutional research, Alfred University. Ladies and gentlemen, the NCAA Honors Committee. (Applause)

INTRODUCTION OF THE MASTER OF CEREMONIES

Mr. Lawless: Tonight's master of ceremonies no doubt feels right at home in Indianapolis. After playing basketball for Ohio State University, he entered the NBA and became the No. 1 draft pick of the Indiana Pacers. After five seasons, injuries became too much.

He then used his voice to support his team, beginning his broadcasting career as an analyst for Indiana Pacers' radio broadcast and television.

His love for sports and for talking led him to ESPN and finally to a home at CBS Sports. Clark Kellogg thrills national audiences each year with his insight and commentary during Final Four action.

Audiovisual Message: In the early '80s, Ohio State's Clark Kellogg established himself as one of the greatest power forwards in Big Ten history.

In 1982, the Buckeyes' big man earned all-Big Ten and MVP honors as the stat sheet stuffer turned in one of the best seasons in OSU history, averaging double digits in both rebounds and points scored.

Those numbers would increase the following season when Kellogg took his skills to the pro game. As the No. 1 pick of the NBA Indiana Pacers, Kellogg earned all-rookie honors by averaging 20 points and nearly 11 rebounds a game.

Today, Kellogg is one of college hoop's elite commentators. Together with Greg Gumbel, he is part of the best basketball studio team in the business.

Mr. Lawless: Ladies and gentlemen, it is my pleasure to introduce the one and only "Special K," tonight's emcee, Mr. Clark Kellogg. (Applause)

TODAY'S TOP EIGHT AWARD WINNERS

Mr. Kellogg: I am so glad to be here this evening. Thank you very much, Dr. Lawless, for that nice, warm introduction. This is a special occasion for me. As you saw, I spent some time in Indianapolis, and after living here for 10 years, from 1983 to 1993, I still have affiliation with this city through my work with the Indiana Pacers.

All three of our children were born here, and it is always special for me to come back to Indianapolis, even more appropriate on such a terrific occasion as tonight. It is amazing, because I looked at the bios of these honorees, and I don't know if at any time in my career as a player, and certainly as a broadcaster, that I have been surrounded by such diverse talent.

Tonight's honorees are amazing athletes. They are visionaries, leaders and inspirations to all of us. I believe I could talk all night about these honorees and still not justly cover all of their accomplishments.

Since I do have a love for talking and I am a broadcaster, one of the first lessons I learned was that brevity is appreciated over longevity, so I won't talk all night.

Tonight, I have the pleasure of introducing you to the Today's Top VIII Award winners, the Silver Anniversary Award honorees, and present a special award, the Inspiration Award, for the first time in NCAA history. Finally, we will meet the 2002 Theodore Roosevelt Award winner.

With more than 361,000 student-athletes playing NCAA sports, it's a pretty sure thing that if you buy a ticket to an NCAA competition, you are sure to see some amazing athletes. You might see a fast break that makes you do a double-take. You might see a dive from a platform that makes your heart stop. But what makes tonight's honorees so special is not just the fact that they are remarkable athletes to watch, but it is their victories off the field that we don't see. It is those victories that have brought them here tonight. They embody what it means to be an NCAA student-athlete, and they transfer that spirit, that competitiveness, into all that they do.

Let me begin tonight by introducing to you a group of outstanding student-athletes—the NCAA Today's Top VIII Award winners.

TODAY'S TOP VIII

Kimberly Black, University of Georgia.

Her swimming talents have made her shine with Olympic gold and two team championship trophies. Her determination to succeed also flowed into her studies. She recently received the NCAA highest academic honor, the Walter Byers Scholarship. She has also been honored for her tireless efforts volunteering for children and medical causes.

Audiovisual Message: In her collegiate career, Kim Black proved to be one of the best swimmers in American waters. As a senior at the University of Georgia, Black was a key member of the Bulldog's 800-freestyle relay team that won both the SEC and NCAA titles for the second straight year.

That effort helped earn Black a sixth all-American honor and Georgia its third straight NCAA title. In the 2000 Summer Olympics, Black displayed her swimming skills to the world. She swam the third leg of the 800-freestyle preliminaries, an event in which the United States would win the gold medal.

After graduating with a perfect 4.0 grade-point average in biology, Kim received one of the NCAA's highest honors—the 2001 NCAA Woman of the Year Award.

Mr. Kellogg: Ladies and gentlemen, Kimberly Black. (Applause) Kimberly will receive her Top VIII Award tonight from Vince Dooley, director of athletics, University of Georgia. (Applause)

Emily Bloss, Emporia State University.

When Emily, an outdoor track and field all-American in the 1,600-meter relay, combined her speed with an outside jump shot, she became the school's second highest career scorer.

This two-sport all-American's honors include being named Emporia State University's student-athlete of the year, Division II basketball player of the year, and an NCAA woman of the year state winner.

Audiovisual Message: For the past four years, opponents have felt the sting of Emily Bloss and the Lady Hornets of Emporia State. The all-American led her team to four straight NCAA Division II tournaments while finishing second all-time on Emporia State's scoring list.

When she wasn't filling up the stat columns on the court, she was filling them up in the classroom. Emily graduated with a near-perfect grade-point average of 3.97.

Emily blossomed in 2001, earning both academic all-American honors and the MIAA most valuable player award as she shattered school records in steals and free throws. Thanks to Emily's 20 points and eight rebounds per game, losses were at a premium at Emporia. In her four years, the Lady Hornets tasted defeat only 10 times in 130 games.

Mr. Kellogg: Ladies and gentlemen, Emily Bloss. (Applause) Emily will receive her Top VIII Award from Dr. Kay Schallenkamp, president of Emporia State University. (Applause)

Misty Hyman, Stanford University.

Her swimming expertise has led her to 28 all-American titles, an NCAA team championships title, and in 2000, an Olympic gold medal. Instead of holding on to her Olympic souvenirs, Misty donated both her suit and Olympic memorabilia to help raise money for Arizona charities.

Knowing firsthand the joy of sports, she volunteered her free time to the Special Olympics at Stanford, serving as president of the

organization her senior year.

Audiovisual Message: Misty Hyman is America's "Madam Butterfly." During her college career, Stanford's standout swimmer has left opponents misty-eyed, being crowned national champion 12 times utilizing her trademark underwater "fish kick." Misty's technique is so dominating that it has spurred a rule change at all U.S. swimming competitions.

In 2000, the international relations major provided the world with a race for the ages. Her teammates, classmates and a whole country watched in awe as what has gone down as one of the biggest upsets in Olympic history. She swam a perfect race at Sydney, taking home gold in the 200-meter butterfly and set an Olympic record.

Hyman repeated her Olympic feat at the 2001 NCAA championships, winning the 200 butterfly for the second time.

Mr. Kellogg: Ladies and gentlemen, Misty Dawn Hyman. (Applause)

Misty will receive her Top VIII Award tonight from Ted Leland, athletics director, Stanford University. (Applause)

Leah Juno, University of Wisconsin, Stevens Point.

As captain of both her cross country and indoor and outdoor track and field teams, Leah led by example, all the way across the finish line. She is a three-time individual NCAA national champion, an eight-time all-American and was vice-president of the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee. This mathematics and computer science graduate's victories in the classroom and on the track led her university to name her the female athlete of the year.

Audiovisual Message: Standing tall is Wisconsin-Stevens Point's little runner with a big heart. Leah Juno is a two-time all-American in cross country and has led the Pointers to six NCAA indoor and outdoor championship team finishes. At only 5 feet 1 inch and 105 pounds, this diminutive dasher is a three-time Division III national champion.

Last year, the three-time indoor track and field all-American dominated her competition in the 800 meters at Oshkosh, setting an arena record.

Outdoors, Juno has three more all-American honors, and in the classroom, this math and computer science major holds a near perfect 3.87 grade-point average. She completed a second double in 2001 taking home the 800-meter Division III outdoor championship.

Mr. Kellogg: Ladies and gentlemen, Leah Juno (Applause)

Leah will receive her Top VIII Award from Frank O'Brien, athletics director, University of Wisconsin, Stevens Point. (Applause)

Nancy Metcalf, University of Nebraska, Lincoln.

Just last month, Nancy played her last collegiate volleyball

match, and she did it with style, guiding the Huskers to the 2001 NCAA Division I Women's Volleyball Championship semifinal match.

This 2000 Olympic team member also shines off the court, spending much of her free time talking to school groups about saying "no" to drugs.

Audiovisual Message: In a powerhouse program like Nebraska, breaking away from the pack and developing into a standout is no ordinary task, but then again Nancy Metcalf is no ordinary athlete.

Since joining the Big Red back in '98, Metcalf has piled up the points and racked up the wins to become one of the most accomplished players in team history. This perennial all-Big 12 selection has led the Cornhuskers to the national semifinals twice and has been named MVP at numerous tournaments. She owns five school records, including most kills and attacks per game in a single season. And she has the highest number of kills in one match with 39.

And as a three-time academic all-American with a 3.8 GPA, as well as being an active volunteer for several youth organizations, there is no doubt she will surely serve as a star contributor no matter what teams she happens to play for along the game of life.

Mr. Kellogg: Ladies and gentlemen, Nancy Metcalf. (Applause)

Nancy will receive her Top VIII Award from Chancellor Harvey Pearlman, University of Nebraska, Lincoln. (Applause)

Bryce Molder, Georgia Institute of Technology.

At Georgia Tech, they call it "Molder Magic." Bryce's strength on the golf course led to six major national player-of-the-year awards. But the "Molder Magic" was more than just great golf. Bryce also served as a mentor to others. This four-year honor roll member was recently honored with the Peach of an Athlete Role Model Award from the Atlanta Area Council of Boy Scouts. That is awesome.

Audiovisual Message: For Bryce Molder, overcoming obstacles on and off the greens has been par for the course. Despite having been stricken with a rare physical defect known as Poland Syndrome, which caused the under-development of his left hand, as well as being born without a left pectoral muscle, Bryce has brilliantly emerged from these challenges to become the No. 1 ranked collegiate player in the nation.

This repeated Palmer and Walker Cup team member and 2001 U.S. Open amateur qualifier has led Georgia Tech to three top-four finishes at the NCAA men's championships.

In addition to six major national accolades, including the Fred Haskins and Jack Nicklaus Awards, the remarkable Molder has set all-time collegiate records for lowest single-season and career scoring averages.

If life had a leader board for grit and determination, the name

Bryce Molder would be right at the top.

Mr. Kellogg: Ladies and gentlemen, Bryce W. Molder. (Applause)

Bryce will receive his Top VIII Award tonight from Bruce Heppler, head men's golf coach, Georgia Institute of Technology. (Applause)

Ruth Riley, University of Notre Dame.

The Notre Dame women's basketball team didn't need the luck of the Irish to capture the 2001 NCAA basketball championship crown. They had Ruth. She scored high in the classroom as well. She was named to the Big East Academic all-Star Team four years in a row. This NCAA postgraduate scholarship recipient is now heating up the floor as a member of the WNBA's Miami Sol.

Audiovisual Message: Standing at 6 foot 4 inches, Ruth Riley has brought Notre Dame's women's basketball program to new heights. While donning her trademark headband, Notre Dame's gentle giant showed her leadership on the court shattering four school records and leading her team in scoring, blocked shots and field-goal percentage while garnering a 3.60 grade-point average majoring in psychology.

In 2001, Riley captained the Irish to their most successful season in school history, taking them all the way to the NCAA championship game. The second of two free throws in the final seconds against Purdue proved to be the clincher for Notre Dame's first women's basketball title. She capped her outstanding run by being named the Final Four's most outstanding player.

Mr. Kellogg: Ladies and gentlemen, Ruth Ellen Riley. (Applause)

Ruth will receive her Top VIII Award from Muffit McGraw, head women's basketball coach, University of Notre Dame. (Applause)

Andre Davis, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University.

This two-sport athlete is a three-time conference champion in track and field. When he wasn't running around the track, he was running the football down the field and becoming an all-American punt returner in 2000. He serves as an inspirational speaker for Athletes in Action. And on New Year's Day, he was all action on the field during the Gator Bowl.

Audiovisual Message: Virginia Tech wide-out Andre Davis takes his cue from no man. Having played in the shadow of former Heisman Trophy winner Michael Vick, the senior speedster has emerged as one of the most explosive players in all of college football.

In this game versus Big East rival West Virginia, the versatile Davis touched the ball three times in six minutes, and scored three times on plays of 30, 64 and 76 yards.

Whether it's in the air or on the ground, Davis has established

himself as Virginia Tech's go-to guy and paved the way for the Hokies' march to this year's Gator Bowl.

Despite being double-teamed, Andre was a giant this season, leading the Hokies in every receiving category. Davis' work in athletics is matched only by his work in the classroom where the three-time all-Big East academic selection is one of only eight Division I-A footballers to earn a postgraduate scholarship.

Mr. Kellogg: Ladies and gentlemen, Andre N. Davis. (Applause)

Andre will receive his Top VIII Award from Tony Ball, assistant football coach, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University. (Applause)

Andre will now speak on behalf of the Top VIII award recipients. Andre, the podium is yours.

RESPONSE — ANDRE DAVIS

Andre Davis: Good evening. First and foremost, I would just like to thank my Lord and Savior, Jesus Christ, for giving me the opportunity to be among some of the greatest people I have ever met. When the NCAA asked me to speak on behalf of the Top VIII Award winners, I felt honored and puzzled at the same time.

I thought the person who had the speed was to be the 4.0 student or all-world athlete, and then they chose me. Don't get me wrong. I worked hard to get where I am today, and I believe it is the upcoming leaders of today who happen to be athletes.

I am honored to share this award with many multitalented university students, gold medalists and NCAA women-of-the-year winners and Olympic gold medalists, and a three-time NCAA national swimmer and AAU team member for the 2000 Olympic Games in Sydney, Australia, and finally a first-round draft pick of the WNBA's Miami Sol. You cannot ask to be surrounded by a more decorated and talented group than that. I would like at this time to congratulate the honorees for a job well done. (Applause)

The thing I like most about this is that all these are great athletes, they are also great students and role models for our youth. It has been a pleasure for me to sit in front of you today to honor these individuals. It truly has been an experience that I will never forget.

Their selection criteria for the award proved athletics and academic achievements, character and leadership abilities count. And after being around the athletes for a day, I realize their character really sets them apart. Character has been truly an indication to me why all of these individuals are so successful on and off the field.

We are here tonight to honor those who have decided not to be mediocre. The athletes who you see in front of you have made a constant effort to strive for excellence and fulfill their dreams. We do not

just play sports, but we make an effort to leave a legacy behind and let people know that although we excelled in sports, we also excelled in life and helped to change the lives of others.

At this time, I would like to also thank Virginia Tech for nominating me for this high honor. On behalf of the Top VIII Award winners, I would like to thank the NCAA Honors Committee for selecting us to receive this prestigious award. I know they are all truly honored to have received this prestigious award also.

Tonight, the NCAA has honored us as individuals for our academic and athletic achievements. However, we all know that we could not have accomplished these tasks on our own. Once again, I would like to thank God for the ability to be able to perform well in all that we do.

I would like to thank our family and friends for the support and many compliments and encouraging words they have given us. I would like to thank the respective colleges for nominating us and believing in our missions to excel. With that support group, we have all been able to use our resources and continue toward our goals and fulfilling our dreams.

Finally, I would like to thank some of the guests who have come to support me and have taught me a lot—Virginia Tech's athletic director Jim Weaver for helping me stay organized with all my travel arrangements, and my academic advisor, Chris Tam, for teaching me it is important to excel. Also, my head coach, Frank Beamer, who could not be here but showed me the importance of hard work; and my receiver coach, Tony Ball, for helping me to concentrate on the details. Also my girlfriend, Jinelli Dusty, for teaching me love and patience. Jim Bachus for teaching me the ins and outs, and my family, who is here in Indiana, and finally, the employees of Buckingham Company who taught me the importance of teamwork off the field. Last but not least, my parents, who could not be here, for their hard work, devotion and patience in dealing with me for 22 years. On behalf of all the honorees, we thank all of our respective guests, the NCAA, the Honors Committee and all who made this night such a special evening. May God bless everyone here in all that you do, and may God bless America. Thank you. (Applause)

Mr. Kellogg: This is such a blessing to be here tonight, to hear those words from the heart. It is just outstanding. I would like to take a moment to just ask all the Top VIII Award winners to please stand again. Now, I would like to ask their parents and anybody who claims any connection or relationship or influence to those who are behind me to stand. It is certainly a team effort to raise young people such as these young adults. We would like to have not only these honorees but all those who have impacted them in such a positive way to

stand. (Applause) You may be seated.

SILVER ANNIVERSARY AWARD WINNERS

Mr. Kellogg: Now, it is time to turn our attention to this year's Silver Anniversary Award recipients. This award honors six former student-athletes 25 years after their graduation. They might have been at the pinnacle of their collegiate careers in 1977, but you are about to find out that none of these former student-athletes took a rest after college.

Instead, they used that same competitive spirit in life in their careers and for charitable public service over the last quarter century. Let me begin introducing you to these great people.

Richard Chapman, Augustana College.

During his collegiate career, our first Silver Anniversary honoree's teammates banked on Richard's ability to make the clutch shot. As the go-to man on the basketball court, he became the second-highest scoring guard in the history of Augustana College. Numbers still seem to add up for Richard. Today, he leads the banking practice of the nation's largest compensation and benefits consulting company.

Audiovisual Message: Success was hardly a longshot for Richard Chapman. The little guard from Augustana College poured in close to 1,400 points during his four-year career and led his team to two Division II playoffs.

His hardwood heroics earned him all-American status while his academic excellence earned him South Dakota's 1977 college athlete-of-the-year honors. In his senior year, Chapman was selected to play for the West squad in the prestigious Pizza Hut Classic, only the second Division II athlete ever to play in the tourney. Ironically, fellow honoree Bo Ellis was on the opposing East squad.

Today, Richard is president and CEO of the banking practice for a leading consulting firm and often finds himself in the company of other former NCAA athletes such as Jack Kemp and former President George Bush.

Ladies and gentlemen, Richard C. Chapman. (Applause)

Richard will receive his Silver Anniversary Award from Mel Klein, faculty athletics representative, Augustana College. (Applause)

Maurice "Bo" Ellis, Marquette University.

Winning a national championship title might have been the pinnacle of success for others, but for "Bo" it was really just the beginning. After playing in the NBA, he has dedicated his career to helping collegiate players perfect their game, and just last year "Bo" was inducted into the Chicagoland Basketball Hall of Fame. Off the court,

"Bo" serves as co-chairman of the local chapter of United Cerebral Palsy.

Audiovisual Message: "Bo" Ellis never missed a game in his college basketball career and he didn't miss many shots either. A creative force both on and off the court, Marquette University's marquee big man even designed his team's uniforms.

The 1970s were the golden years of basketball at Marquette and Ellis was selected to the all-America team in each of his four seasons.

"Bo" capped off his amazing college career by captaining Al Maguire's Warriors to their first and only NCAA title.

He was a first-round NBA draft pick by Washington and played for Denver for three seasons before returning to Marquette as an assistant coach. He remained for 10 years. Since 1998, Ellis has been the head coach at Chicago State University.

Mr. Kellogg: Ladies and gentlemen, "Bo" Ellis. (Applause)

"Bo" will receive his Silver Anniversary Award from Henry "Hank" Raymonds, former athletics director and head men's basketball coach, Marquette University. (Applause)

Herman Frazier, Arizona State University.

While runners today may prefer to wear gold running shoes, Herman preferred to wear his gold around his neck. He captured both an Olympic gold and bronze medal during the 1976 Olympics. This eight-time all-American and former world record holder has served as one of three vice-presidents of the United States Olympic Committee since 1996.

Audiovisual Message: As the anchor for Arizona State's 1976 champion relay team, Herman Frazier went that extra yard to secure a victory when the fate of the team was placed solely in his hands.

And as the youngest member of the '76 U.S. Olympic relay team, Frazier gained solid ground in the opening leg of the 4 x 400 meter relay. He provided the necessary momentum to catapult his fast-paced peers past their pesky competitors to clinch a first-place finish and a well-deserved gold medal.

Then in 1977, Frazier put his best foot forward again and once more reigned supreme by mustering this mad dash that earned him the NCAA championship in the 400-meter run.

Since then, he has dedicated his time to running various athletic-oriented programs and events, first at his alma mater, Arizona State, and now as director of athletics at Alabama-Birmingham.

Mr. Kellogg: Ladies and gentlemen, Herman R. Frazier. (Applause)

Herman received his Silver Anniversary Award tonight from his former United States Olympic track and field coach, Dr. Leroy Walker. (Applause)

John Naber, University of Southern California.

After collecting four gold and one silver Olympic swimming medals, John has continued his Olympic contribution, serving as a torchbearer in three Olympic torch relays. He also serves as president of the United States Olympic Alumni Association.

As one of USC's most decorated swimmers, he has since created his own company that among other things arranges for athletes to give motivational speeches.

Audiovisual Message: From 1974 to 1977, USC's sensation, John Naber, swam his way straight into the records book with god-like grace. This poolside Poseidon propelled his triumphant Trojans to four straight national championships, as well as winning 10 individual first-place titles in the 500-yard freestyle, the 100- and 200-yard backstroke, and various team relays, which allowed him the distinguished honor of receiving the NCAA Today's Top V Award in 1978.

John also got the chance to display his aquatic aptitude to the whole world as a member of the 1976 U.S. Olympic swim team.

This underwater warrior made quite a splash by winning four gold medals and setting world-record times in the 100- and 200-meter backstroke. John continues to contribute to the spirit of American athletics as an Olympic broadcaster.

Mr. Kellogg: Due to a previous commitment, John could not join us tonight. In keeping with his championship tradition, tomorrow morning he will carry the Olympic torch as it makes its way to Salt Lake City, where the Olympics will take place in just 26 days. John has already received his Silver Anniversary Award from his former USC coach, Peter Daland, in Los Angeles, and we videotaped his reaction to this honor. Ladies and gentlemen, John Naber.

Mr. Naber: Thank you very, very much. Let me apologize for not being in Indianapolis this evening. As you know, the Olympic torch is making its way through Southern California, and first thing tomorrow I will be privileged to carry the flame. And, it's on behalf of those Olympic ideals that sports is supposed to make better people, not just better ball carriers, that I am privileged to receive this award.

My thanks to the NCAA and, of course, Peter Daland, the head swimming coach at the university where I earned those awards. And, of course, my congratulations to the fellow recipients—Richard, Betsy, "Bo," Rod and, of course, my Olympic teammate, Herm Frazier. And the two swimming ladies in the audience, Misty Hyman, and Kimberly Black, congratulations. Remember, you only have 25 years to do something worthy of a return invitation.

Again, thank you so much for this very prestigious award.
(Applause)

Mr. Kellogg: Our next recipient is Rodney Slater, Eastern Michigan University.

Thanks to Rodney, we can all breathe a little easier. As former U.S. Secretary of Transportation, air pollution from motor vehicles dropped 20 percent.

But on the football team as a tailback and team captain for Eastern Michigan, he often left his opponents gasping for air, rushing for 1,330 career yards. Rodney was also the perfect person for a different kind of drive. He headed a fund-raising drive for federal employees that raised more than \$130 million for nonprofit organizations.

Audiovisual Message: Rodney Slater was a football star at Eastern Michigan during the mid-70s who learned to navigate a path for success by traveling in the direction of his dreams.

Slater's own course of dreams reached fruition when he was appointed the nation's 13th Secretary of Transportation under President Bill Clinton.

During his tenure, he called on the country's top athletes to help in programs that resulted in the safest transportation system in the nation's history. As a result of his involvement in political and humanitarian causes, Slater has earned the respect of influential world leaders by forging the pathway of his own success.

Mr. Kellogg: Ladies and gentlemen, Rodney E. Slater. (Applause)

Rodney will receive his Silver Anniversary Award from Dr. Samuel A. Kirkpatrick, president, Eastern Michigan University.

Betsy King, Furman University.

Betsy's name is synonymous with women's golf. Many would be surprised that she also has a mean pick-and-rolé. At Furman, Betsy was both a golf and basketball standout. But it was her love of golf that she transformed into a lucrative career, becoming the first LPGA player to reach the \$6 million mark in career earnings. Her efforts off the links truly make her a champion. She has raised millions of dollars for scholarships and children's charities.

Audiovisual Message: It don't mean a thing if you ain't got that swing. Since leading Furman College to a national championship in 1976, Betsy King's winning swing has meant a great deal to the world of women's golf.

This two-time U.S. Open winner and LPGA player of the year is just the second woman in history to secure the Nabisco Classic three times.

Along with her top-notch talent, Betsy's devotion to her fans and to the game of golf itself has elevated her to a level of prominence shared only among an elite few in the LPGA.

And as she proceeds to play out her part as both legendary athlete and respected role model, Betsy King will continue to be a shining example of how we all can reach our dreams by always swinging for the stars.

Mr. Kellogg: Ladies and gentlemen, Betsy King. (Applause)

Betsy will receive her Silver Anniversary Award tonight from Gary Clark, athletics director, Furman University. (Applause) Betsy also will speak on behalf of the Silver Anniversary Award winners.

RESPONSE—BETSY KING

Betsy King: Thank you very much. It is indeed a pleasure to be here tonight and to represent all the Silver Anniversary Award winners. I can't speak of anyone's help for this award, but I have managed to gain 25 pounds in the last 25 years. I am hoping to reverse that trend the next 25 years.

On behalf of all of the Silver Anniversary Award winners, thank you to the NCAA for this recognition. We are honored and grateful that you have remembered us in this way. We also congratulate Mrs. Shriver on her much-deserved Teddy Roosevelt Award and finally, the Top VIII Award winners and the Inspiration Award winners. We congratulate and wish you continued success in the coming years.

I feel very humbled to be among this class of Silver Anniversary Award winners. Other than Mr. Frazier, I had not met any of them before this weekend. But as I read over their bios and list of achievements, I was very impressed.

They are all from respected colleges and universities, and some were on the Olympic stage for success on the professional level. More importantly, this year's class of winners has contributed greatly to society for their careers and volunteer involvement in various civic and charitable endeavors.

They have used their influence to make a positive difference in the world around them. I have fond memories of my college experience at Furman University. The passage of Title IX legislation was just beginning to impact women's sports.

My junior year in college was the first year Furman offered athletic scholarships for women. I received \$300 my junior year and \$500 my senior year. The budget for the entire women's athletic program was \$125,000. The football team was losing \$500,000 a year.

That perceived inequity led to the formation of the Women's Athletics Association and to meet with the Furman president each year to request, maybe demand, more support of women's athletics. I am happy to report that today Furman has six full scholarships for women in golf, as well as a fully equitable athletic program.

I love all sports and competed in field hockey as well as basket-

ball and golf. It was not until my senior year that I made the decision to just play golf. I remember my junior year civilization professor when I was absent for golf and field hockey asking me if I was going to go to college for school or sports.

What I failed to realize is that through discipline, hard work, sacrifice, patience and perseverance, I was learning from my athletic involvement. That helped me to be more successful in the classroom and later in life. I believe the lessons we learn in the classroom are important, and they are enhanced by the ones we learn on the field of athletic competition.

As a member of the board of Fellowship of Christian Athletes, I learned that the mission statement of FCA begins with the phrase "to present to athletes and coaches and all who may influence the challenge of receiving Jesus Christ as his Lord." There is a big influence.

A study conducted by one of the largest brewing companies in the United States indicated that 96 percent of the American population is influenced by the world of sports. It is not a question of whether there will be influence, but only what kind of influence will result in athletics.

As athletic administrators and leaders of your respected educational institutions, it is important to remind your coaches and athletes of this influence. Their influence will lead to the betterment of society and we will be able to feel proud of our involvement in contributions to the world of sports.

Again, on behalf of the Silver Anniversary Award winners, we say thank you to the NCAA for this honor and recognition. We also thank our families and friends who have supported us as well. Thank you very much. (Applause)

Mr. Kellogg: Thank you, Betsy. If we could just take a moment again to give a round of applause to all of our Silver Anniversary Award honorees tonight. (Applause)

At this time, I would like to call Dr. Bob Lawless back to the podium.

Mr. Lawless: From time to time, the NCAA Honors Committee presents its Award of Valor. The selection criteria consider individuals who, when confronted with a situation involving personal danger, averted or minimized potential disaster by courageous actions or noteworthy bravery.

The events surrounding September 11 would suggest that 2001 is a year in which the award of valor would surely be presented. But the committee has chosen, and rightfully so, I believe, not to do so. In a very real sense, the committee knows too much, and too little, to properly select an individual or even a group of individuals to honor.

President Dempsey identified two former student-athletes who

were true heroes in his comments at the opening business session this afternoon. Michael Weinberg, a former baseball standout at St. John's University, was a New York City firefighter who left the golf course on his day off to rush to the World Trade Center where he was killed trying to help others. And Todd Beamer, another baseball player from Wheaton College in Illinois, was aboard United Flight 93 and was one of those passengers who resisted the hijackers rather than sit passively while another tragedy unfolded.

But there were other individuals, other acts of courage and other examples of personal sacrifice from that fateful day. Undoubtedly, there are numerous examples of heroism and valor about which we will never know the full story.

So, although no physical award of valor is being presented this year, it is presented in the real spirit of that award to the brave souls of September 11, known and unknown, who when confronted with a situation of great peril, the likes of which we hope never to witness again, responded with courage.

In their last acts, they strengthened our hearts to meet what lies before us and to do what must be done. Will you please join me in honoring them with a moment of silence. Thank you.

INTRODUCTION OF THE INSPIRATION AWARD WINNERS

Mr. Kellogg: These past months we have heard a lot about heroes, individuals who give us hope and inspiration. Tonight, you are about to meet two student-athletes who were faced with very personal battles. They each encountered not just one, but two, life-altering situations of their own, refusing to fold to adversity.

These amazing individuals turned to their competitive spirit inside and rose to the challenge. Through incredible perseverance, dedication and determination, not only have each overcome these life-changing events, but they now serve as role models to give hope and inspiration to others in similar situations.

To honor our NCAA heroes, the NCAA Honors Committee has created the Inspiration Award. It will be awarded tonight for the very first time in NCAA history to two true inspirations.

Maggie Maloy, Defiance College.

On an early morning training run with her high-school cross country team, the life path of our first honoree was changed forever.

Audiovisual Message: Maggie Maloy is a true portrait in courage. A varsity letter winner in both cross country and track and field at Defiance College, Maggie has already overcome two life-altering experiences.

In 1994, Maggie was abducted, raped and shot five times. She survived to run again.

In the winter of 2000, she broke her pelvis during a car accident. Her road to recovery was an uphill climb, having to endure months of grueling rehabilitation.

But her desire to run again fueled a miraculous recovery that led her back to racing that very same fall.

It is only fitting that Maggie should graduate from an institution named Defiance College, for her strength and winning spirit has surely defied all odds.

Mr. Kellogg: Ladies and gentlemen, Maggie Maloy. (Applause)

Maggie is receiving the Inspiration Award from Dr. James Harris, president of Defiance College.

[The assembly extended a prolonged standing ovation.]

RESPONSE—INSPIRATION AWARD WINNER MAGGIE MALOY

Maggie Maloy: Good evening. Thank you so much for that standing ovation. I have to thank the NCAA Honors Committee for selecting me to receive such a prestigious award as well as being one of the first recipients. I have always lived my life as an inspiration for others. After the first incident, when I was shot in high school, pain was minimal and it was never so clear to run again.

I didn't care what I had to do, I was going to be back on that track and back on the cross country course as soon as I could. In high school, I just knew I wanted to be part of the team again, a part of something normal. I didn't want to be a rape victim isolated from everyone else, and tonight I have to thank my high-school coaches and my dear friends from back home, and the teachers who are here who helped me become a student-athlete again.

In college, when I broke my pelvis, that was harder to come back from. There was a lot more pain and there was a lot more self-doubt. Self-doubt was my biggest demon that I had to overcome. I will never forget my head coach, Wayne Stacy. When you have a coach like him there is no room for doubt. I was sitting in his office and I said: "Coach, I don't know if I can do this. I don't know. I have been laying on my back for 2 1/2 or three months. I have to have a full year of competition. I don't think I could do it."

He hung up the phone, turned to me and said: "Mag, whatever confidence you don't have, I have enough for both of us. It is time." That was that. We went down to the track and I ran the slowest 400 meters of my life. I knew after that 400 meters I was going to be fine, but I kept going for another 800 meters just to see if the coach could make it, which he did.

I have to thank Defiance College for opening their doors to me and allowing me to become a student-athlete that I knew I was capable of becoming, for teaching me to serve well in the Defiance com-

munity. I have a special thank you to Dr. Richard Kaiser for nominating me for such an award and for being able to keep it up his sleeve for so long and not cracking at all.

I thank my mom, who taught me how to be able to be a survivor, and her inspiration in her raising of three children all by herself. My oldest brother, Keith, who is also my godfather, he had a lot of praise for me, and my older brother, Michael, who thought it was cool that with his little sister he could go see the college girls.

It gave me a lot of inspiration to be a student-athlete. I accept this award on behalf of all student-athletes who are an inspiration both in competition and everyday lives, who will never receive such a prestigious award. I accept the award for them.

Finally, I know a lot of student-athletes are not here tonight, but if you are looking for an inspirational figure, you don't always have to look to Hollywood to find that person. You can look at your friends, your family, your coaches, but more importantly, look inside yourselves and you will find the true inspirational person. Thank you so very much. God bless you. (Applause)

Mr. Kellogg: Thank you, Maggie, for the inspiration that you are and continue to be. Thank you very much, and we thank you for those words.

Our next Inspiration Award honoree also defines what it means to rise above the obstacles that life sometimes places in front of us.

Sam Paneno, *University of California, Davis.*

Already scoring two touchdowns, Sam was having the game of his life and was leading his team into overtime. But a tackle forced him to find an even greater victory inside himself.

Audiovisual Message: September 11 changed Sam Paneno's life. But in his case, it was September 11, 1999. He was making the first start of his career for UC Davis. Sam responded with 116 yards and two touchdowns to help send the game into overtime. On the overtime play, his dream game turned into an awful nightmare.

A knee injury threatened his life and then cost him his leg, but eight days after the operation Sam was back on the sidelines giving inspiration to his teammates.

Today, when he is not assisting the disabled, he still enjoys spending his time surfing and mountain climbing with the aid of a prosthetic leg.

By positively handling his circumstance with grace and purpose, Sam has continued to be a shining example to a countless number of lives on and off the football field.

Mr. Kellogg: Ladies and gentlemen, Sam Paneno. (Applause)

Sam will receive his Inspiration Award tonight from Greg Warzecka, athletics director, University of California, Davis.

(Applause)

RESPONSE—INSPIRATION AWARD WINNER SAM PANENO

Sam Paneno: First of all, I would like to thank God for allowing me to share this time with all of you, and also I would like to thank the NCAA and the Honors Committee for bestowing this award on me. I again would like to thank UC Davis for its help in everything.

In fact, they helped me more than they know. They have helped me with my family and other things. Most importantly, I would like to thank my family and my girlfriend for their unconditional love and support. When I thought of that, I thought many times I definitely am not indestructible.

There were times when I was falling and they were there to pick me up. I believe this is the true essence of inspiration. It is the notion that inspiration has little to do with me as an individual, and a lot more to do with we as a community.

For me, inspiration is a relationship that is shared with others. Not one person owns inspiration or not one particular instance owns inspiration. Through this relationship together, we share the meaning of life and loss and love and death, and many other traumatic experiences that without us it might be a lot less meaningful.

So, I humbly accept this award as a symbol of our celebration of the spirit we call inspiration. Thank you very much. (Applause)

THEODORE ROOSEVELT AWARD WINNER

Mr. Kellogg: Thank you very much, Sam. Now, ladies and gentlemen, it is my honor and pleasure and privilege to introduce to you the 35th recipient of the Theodore Roosevelt Award. As you know, this prestigious award is presented each year to a prominent national figure who competed in varsity sports at the NCAA level and to this day exemplifies the ideals of athletics.

In 1903, President Roosevelt, a great lover and believer of sport, said: "In the battle of life, the credit belongs to the man or woman who is actually in the arena, who spends himself or herself in a worthy cause."

With that quote in mind, tonight we bestow the NCAA's highest honor to a visionary and humanitarian who has dedicated her life to a worthy cause.

For more than three decades, she has been a leader in the worldwide struggle to improve the lives of people with mental retardation, both through Special Olympics and the Joseph P. Kennedy, Jr. Foundation. Her advocacy efforts led to the establishment of the President Kennedy Committee on Mental Retardation; the National Institute for Child Health and Human Development; National

Standards and Testing for Individuals with Mental Retardation; research centers at major medical schools across the country; and creation of the "Community of Caring" program for pregnant teens and for at-risk youth.

As founder of Special Olympics, Mrs. Shriver has opened the door for people with mental retardation to discover their skills, talents and courage through sports, and to find joy, friendship, physical fitness and fulfillment. Through her leadership and devotion, the world has come to appreciate the gifts, spirit and determination of people with mental retardation as well as their needs, capabilities and rights.

Today, more than 1 million athletes in 150 countries participate in the worldwide Special Olympics movement, and the families of people with mental retardation have found support and resources to successfully include their family members in the everyday activities of their community.

If devoting your life to a worthy cause is truly the victory in the battle of life, Mrs. Eunice Kennedy Shriver is truly a champion.

Audiovisual Message: Eunice Kennedy Shriver is a member of one of the most influential families of the 20th century. But while her brothers concentrated on politics, Mrs. Shriver found an equally important way to serve. In 1963, she opened up her home to children with mental retardation with the strong belief that these youth were far more capable in sports and physical activities than many experts thought. In 1968, Mrs. Shriver helped plan and sponsor the first International Special Olympics Summer Games. Chicago's Soldier Field played host as 900 athletes from 25 states and Canada competed in 200 events. Thirty years later, from those Games, a major worldwide movement evolved. Since its 1968 debut, millions of children and adults with mental retardation have participated in Special Olympics.

And there is no doubt Mrs. Shriver has helped these exceptional individuals find fulfillment and changed the world's perception of them.

Mr. Kellogg: Ladies and gentlemen, I call upon Dr. Bob Lawless to present the NCAA Theodore Roosevelt Award.

Mr. Lawless: Thank you, Clark. Mrs. Shriver, it is my distinct honor to present to you the Theodore Roosevelt Award, the highest honor the NCAA bestows upon an individual. I present this award to you for your lifetime dedication to others.

By bringing athletics and opportunities into the lives of people with mental retardation, you have made millions of victories possible for others.

Ladies and gentlemen, the executive vice-president of the Joseph

P. Kennedy Foundation and founder and honorary chair of Special Olympics, Mrs. Eunice Shriver.

[The assembly extended a prolonged standing ovation.]

RESPONSE — MRS. EUNICE KENNEDY SHRIVER

Mrs. Shriver: First, let me say that I have lived a long time and I have traveled to a lot of countries, but I must say tonight I have met two of the most extraordinary people—Mr. Paneno and Ms. Maloy. I have never seen any couple with more courage and sense of forgiveness, sense of hope and sense of a future.

So I am delighted to be here on the platform close to them, and I admire them enormously. I ask you all once again to rise and give them a hand of applause, this extraordinary group.

[The assembly extended a prolonged standing ovation.]

I express my deep appreciation to Stanford University for nominating me for this prestigious award. I thank the NCAA Honors Committee for choosing me as its 35th recipient. I say thank you for allowing me the opportunity to be with such extraordinary company, for I joined this wonderful group—the outstanding Theodore Roosevelt, and our dedicated former Presidents Dwight Eisenhower, Ronald Reagan, Gerald Ford and George Bush, and many other recipients who have been in fitness in sports and who make the world a better place.

Now, I bring you some distressing news from Washington. The unemployment rate has gone up 2.3 percent this week. So now, we look to the future for Special Olympic athletes. Tonight we celebrate the story not of the world's mighty and gifted, but the stories of the simple acts of perseverance and of courage, and love from people with mental retardation and their families.

Years ago, mothers and fathers and children with special needs challenged the experts who had discarded their children in warehouses. Their parents said: "My child is of value and of human value, a transcended value, and my child is not a mistake." These mothers and fathers were demanding respect for their children.

They detected indifference, they fought against ridicule, they overcame obstacle after obstacle to find the challenge to share the joy of human love proclaimed by their children. They taught us great lessons of love, justice and faith, and the power of their own to create a better world.

As we look to the future, however, the Special Olympic athletes have taken the mantle of leadership into their own hands. They are speaking up telling their own story, reminding the world that they are not looking for pity, but that they are an individual with ideas, with feelings and with dreams for the future.

They stand with us today, their smiles beaming with ours, announcing their abilities and proclaiming that their time has come. Special Olympians in their own ways are spokespersons for freedom itself. They ask for the freedom to live, the freedom to belong, the freedom to contribute and the freedom to have a chance.

Of all the values that unite our country and inspire us to seek a better world, no value holds a higher place than the value of freedom. When my younger brother became President 40 years ago, he reminded the nation of the values that he had learned from his own mother.

The bravery of the fallen is to rise, the freedom of Thomas Jefferson's Declaration of Independence, and the heroism of American fallen brothers and sisters of World War II. Each believed in service. Each year, they were willing to give their lives for freedom and our hopes, to pay the price and bear the burden needed to meet the hardships, to support their friends, always to assure the success of the country.

As President Kennedy, the athletes with Special Olympics were also going to pay the price of freedom. They now know freedom is won not only in the battlefield but also in every nation and every community and every place. Since the tragedy of September 11, 2001, all Americans must now carry the torch of freedom to a new town and a new place, and reaffirm the values of freedom, education, caring and compassion. We must fight the war and our vision to the most vulnerable at home and abroad.

I see this award as a tribute not to me but to the spirit of the Special Olympics and to a new call to freedom and to a new call of caring and loving. Think now for a moment of those children and adults who have special needs who are not here, those in South Africa who sit home in a cold institution, of those in China who were not given the right to go to school, and those in Washington who cry at night, because they don't understand why they don't have any friends.

Think, too, of their parents. Think of the mother who loves the special child and who feels so desperately alone. They have done nothing wrong, they have committed no crime, and they have potentially nowhere to go to. They are the world's most innocent victims and they have suffered all of this only because they are different, but they are not free.

So I humbly thank you not only for this award, but also because I want to join you to lead the world in change. The Special Olympics movement is committed to the largest campaign in history—a new campaign for freedom and caring and love.

We have pledged to bring the torch to 1 million new athletes from

150 nations by the year 2005. At the same time, we also have committed to use sports to change the lives of everyone they touched, the lives of families, the lives of the children, volunteers, health-care professionals and political needs worldwide.

I invite you today to join us in this simple transforming movement forward. If you are young, you can cheer. If you are an athlete, you can coach, and if you are a parent, you can lead with pride. If you are interested in any way at all, you can share. Each of your universities can run clinics to teach skills.

You can open up your gymnasiums for our practices. You can invite Special Olympic teams to your events to showcase their amazing abilities. Tonight, I ask you to join this cause for action, to make room on your playing field, to make room in your heart and to make room in the future for the freedom of 1 million new athletes of Special Olympics.

Of course, all of this will take more than words. It will require action, too. Over the years, many of you have put your words in writing and many universities have helped local Special Olympic programs. Many have given and many students have offered their time as you have heard tonight.

But maybe we can do more. Maybe the student-athletes of this country, the universities of this country, and the people of this country are ready for a bigger challenge. Maybe the NCAA and its vast following are ready to make a bold statement to support Special Olympics here in this country and around the world, to issue a call for action to help us recruit the million athletes, to help build our joys and acceptance through television and other forms of public awareness, to launch campaigns to raise the resources necessary to give each new athlete a challenge.

Maybe it is time for the NCAA and Special Olympics to respond to the worldwide hunger for peace, by pledging to work together through sports to build a new bridge of understanding for the world's most fundamental and to build a bridge of understanding for all of us.

Is this too much? I think not. I think that it is achievable. In fact, I think it is our destiny. After all, who would have thought 30 years ago that all these lonely forgotten children who came to Chicago that you saw a few moments ago for their first Special Olympic Games, how they inspired the world?

They did inspire the world, and I hope they will do it again forever. If you decide to help Special Olympics, please contact the Web in your city. Now, I thank all of you for this wonderful award and I thank each person for all they will do in the future in joining the campaign for Special Olympics.

In the spirit of Special Olympics, I invite you to remember the

words of long ago: "Have faith, hope and love of God, but the greatest of these is love." Thank you.

[The assembly extended a prolonged standing ovation.]

Mr. Lawless: As a tribute to Mrs. Shriver's university, please join me in recognizing the athletics director of Stanford University. Ladies and gentlemen, Mr. Ted Leland. (Applause)

What an amazing evening. We have certainly met some outstanding individuals this evening and we were only able to take a small look at their many achievements.

Clark, thank you for helping us shine the spotlight on each of them tonight. You did a fantastic job helping to tell their stories. We know firsthand how busy your schedule is and it is wonderful that you took time to come back to Indiana to help us celebrate these great individuals.

As a token of our appreciation, the NCAA will make a donation to the Ohio State University Frank Hale Black Cultural Center in your name. (Applause)

Tonight's program will be highlighted during a special ESPN presentation Thursday, January 31, at 2 p.m. Eastern time.

Sitting here among tonight's audience, you have no doubt witnessed how even just one person can make a huge and positive impact on the world. I hope that each of you leave here inspired by our special guests and that we all take just a little bit of their determination, courage and inspiration home with us tonight.

To bring a close to the special evening, John Galgano will present the Benediction.

BENEDICTION

Mr. Galgano: Let us always remind ourselves of the courage and fortitude of the student-athletes we have celebrated tonight. May their example serve to inspire us in our own lives as we strive to reach greater heights as educators, coaches, administrators, student-athletes and as people.

We thank the honored former student-athletes for setting a standard of excellence, and we thank the current student-athletes for continuing to build upon this great legacy. And let us thank all of these student-athletes for bringing out the very best in intercollegiate athletics and for helping to bring back a sense of unity and joy to our families, campuses and, indeed, to our nation.

Four-sport student-athlete Jackie Robinson once said: "A person's life is worth nothing except in the impact it has on others' lives." May we all have the courage to live our lives in the spirit of giving.

Mr. Lawless: Thank you all very much. Have a good evening, have a happy new year, and may God bless each of you and may God bless America.

■ Division I Forum

Monday Morning, January 14, 2002

The Division I Forum was called to order at 8 a.m., with Division I Management Chair Charles Harris, commissioner of the Mid-Eastern Athletic Conference, presiding.

OPENING REMARKS

Mr. Harris: Ladies and gentlemen, good morning. I want you to know this gavel is used purely for ceremonial purposes, but they tell me I am supposed to do it. Since it sounded pretty good the first time, I will do it one more time. My name is Charles Harris. I am the chair of the Division I Management Council and the commissioner of the Mid-Eastern Athletic Conference. I would like to welcome you to this 96th Convention of the NCAA. The session this morning is a relatively new feature of the Convention.

As you all know, five years ago when we did our restructuring, we added a session that included the forums. The intent of these forums, basically, is to give all of us an opportunity to share ideas with some give and take from the membership and, frankly, some thoughtful dialogue on issues that may be before us.

As you will recall, last year the principal topic of discussion during this forum was amateurism, and I think we all recall a very lively discussion that led to some additional work by both the staff and by the committee that was developing collectively on our behalf that ultimately will become legislation as we work through the process later this spring.

We have three issues for today. We will devote a total of four hours. There is a break in there after the second session. But the three topics we will cover today are the work of the Board and Division I Task Force that has focused on establishing strategic direction for Division I, beginning with an economic baseline study.

Our second forum discussion topic will be a football study, which in large part focuses on various legislation regarding membership for Division I and an ongoing review of postseason football criteria. The third element of our forum today will be an update of the work of the academic consultants, a subcommittee of the AEC Cabinet that has been working quite extensively on the seamless model for initial eligibility and continuing eligibility.

Following the presentation on each of those topics, we would like to encourage you to take advantage of the microphones placed in the aisles and ask questions of the presenters so that as they continue to do their work they will get a greater sense of any questions or concerns that you may have.

They will ultimately give us some legislation that is consistent

with the goals and expectations of all Division I institutions. With that general description of what the next four hours will be like, I would like to introduce the first forum topic, which is the Board task force.

The presenters are Presidents Lawrence and Brit Kirwan. To briefly introduce the presenters, Brit Kirwan is chair of the Board of Directors. He is in his fifth year as president of Ohio State University after having served nine years as the president of the University of Maryland at College Park. He received his bachelor's degree from the University of Kansas and his master's and doctoral degrees in mathematics from Rutgers State University in New Jersey. Also taking part in that presentation is Fran Lawrence, chair of the Division I Board of Directors. He is president of Rutgers University of New Jersey, serves on the Executive Committee of the Association of American Universities, and is the Big East representative for the NCAA Board of Directors. Dr. Lawrence received his Ph.D. in French classical literature from Tulane. Brit Kirwan will lead the discussion.

Brit, good morning.

TASK FORCE FORUM

Brit Kirwan (Ohio State University): Charles, thank you very much for the introduction. The leadership that you provide to the Management Council over the past several years has been exceptional. We all are most appreciative of the good work you have done.

You mentioned that I had been at Ohio State for five years. Sometimes it feels like that. But I am actually only in my fourth year there having moved from that football power at the University of Maryland to Ohio State. Fran and I will give a status report of the task force. We will do a bit of a tag team here. He will actually do most of the heavy lifting, because he will describe in some detail some of the issues the task force is dealing with. I would just like to say a few words about the creation of the task force and the anticipated outcome of it.

It really got created because there have been a whole series of issues that have come to our attention over the last 18 months or so. Many of them are not new issues to us. They were presented to us in perhaps a more sharply focused way.

They include things like the recent report from the NCAA on graduation rates, especially in sports like football and men's basketball, where we have seen absolutely no improvement or very little improvement from rates that we all say are low. Despite legislation and good effort and good intentions, we just have not seen the progress any of us would like to see in improving those graduation rates. There is a whole issue of the graduation rate themselves. I don't think anybody is completely happy with the current computations of the graduation rate as a fully effective way of measuring current academic departments of programs.

There have been reports and studies about the time demands on

student-athletes. There have been the NCAA and the Knight Commission reports on the cost of intercollegiate athletics, the rising cost and the diminishing number of Division I-A teams, schools that are actually operating in the black.

So given these and other issues, it seemed appropriate that the Division I Board develop some sense of agenda assessing which of these are the ones that are most important for us to attack and to develop a process and a time line for responding to these issues.

I appointed members of the Division I Board to a task force to work back through the Board. The Board has responded to the report of the task force and put it into the processes of the NCAA through the Management Council and elsewhere.

Let me begin by just identifying the members of the task force. I think they are on the slide over there. All of these individuals are members of the Division I Board. We feel they are a good representation from the membership on the Board in Division I. I asked Fran Lawrence to chair the Board, and he will come to the podium in just a few moments to make his remarks. I would like to speak to the charge of the Board and sort of put that out where you can see it. One of the things we recognized as we began to think about how we would systematically approach and respond to some of these issues was that Division I, unlike the other two divisions, had never really established a context within which to make decisions. We had not developed a vision, a mission or a set of guiding principles. The other two divisions have done that. So it seemed important as a first responsibility for the task force to actually develop such a framework that would be taken back to the Board for approval. Fran will discuss where we are with that today.

The second is sort of what I was just mentioning, namely, to review some of the most important issues that have been raised by the NCAA and others about academic deficiencies and fiscal excesses in intercollegiate athletics. To identify those issues that are of the greatest need of attention and develop some process by which the division can respond to those issues, we wanted in the beginning an economic study of the cost of intercollegiate athletics and the actions that drive the ever-rising cost for member institutions.

So that is the charge to the task force and the time line of what has happened so far. We have had two meetings in person. We have had a couple of conference calls. I think the task force is moving on a very fast time line, and it is in position to reach some conclusions in the not-too-distant future.

In any case, there will be an initial report to the Division I Board of Directors in April. So that is the background and the current status. I would like now to call on Fran to talk in somewhat more detail about the current academic capacities.

Fran Lawrence (Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, New Brunswick): Those of us who function in higher education learn that change is important. Change is also difficult. Those of us on this

reform committee who have been appointed by Brit feel very seriously that change is necessary and reform is necessary.

We go about our business in an inclusive way. This committee works on particular items, but we expect that anybody who has an idea about how to address some of these problems that we have seen over the last few years should feel free to forward that idea to us.

There is a group of six conferences that are also working simultaneously on many of the same issues that we are concerned about. We are receiving that information as well. So we take this job very seriously. In the end, we want to see change, we want to correct some of the problems that we currently have in intercollegiate athletics, and we want to be seen as in charge of correcting those problems. When I say "we," I mean everybody in this room, everybody connected with intercollegiate athletics who may not be here today.

Let me first begin with the mission statement that we have drafted. This statement will go to the Board of Directors this afternoon. I am going to walk you through some of it. You should have it at your places. To begin with, we will look at the upper paragraph, which is the vision part of it, and then the Division I mission statement and the guiding principles.

Division statements, as it says on the slide up there, identify what Division I desires to become. A mission statement is simply that. We are familiar with that because all of our own institutions have mission statements. We assert the over-arching purpose and we provide the foundation for striving toward the vision of the division. Then we deal with some fundamental principles by which we will be guided as a Board in making decisions as we move into the future. Let me break down some of that for you. Going back to that first paragraph again, you will see that we want to provide student-athletes with an exemplary academic and athletic experience.

We support the primacy of our academic mission. One of the main reasons why we do what we do every single day is because we are working in academic institutions. That is 90 percent of what we do. We cannot have a contradiction in place. We set rigorous standards of academics and academic achievement for a diverse community of athletes. We want to exemplify the highest level of sportsmanship in amateur athletic performance as well as be the source of pride for the university community, both internal and external.

Then if you go to the paragraph on the Division I mission statement and guiding principles, you see that the NCAA Division I regulations and policies and actions and consequences will be formulated and will be elevated in accordance with the following guiding principles for the decision-making.

We recognize and support the primacy of the members' academic mission. We advance the highest standard of amateur athletics. We advocate all the components of Division I community awareness and commitment to high standards. We want to increase access for a diverse body of student-athletes who meet the institution's standards

for all students. We want to ensure a well-rounded college experience for student-athletes. We also want to support student-athletes in taking full advantage of their college education. We want to underline that—that some of our initial discussions focus in that particular area.

Student-athletes cannot only excel in athletics, they can certainly excel in academics. We have to be the ones to help guide them through that process. We want to present national championships that support the integrity and the interests of Division I institutions.

We also want to protect Division I athletics from undue influence of commercial interests. I don't need to remind you about that. Every day, we see it written in the papers, but when we talk to some of our colleagues, some of our alumni, they raise those questions with us. Are we protecting the undue influence of commercial interests? We want to require that collegiate athletic operations work under the institution's mission and general financial controls and do not compromise the integrity of the overall university resources. That's really what the guiding principles tell you. I hope you take time to read through all of this and continue to monitor our progress in this particular area.

Let me talk briefly about the review of academic standards, which I alluded to a couple of seconds ago. I am not going to go into this in a detailed way, because you are going to get a presentation from the NCAA staff that I think you will find very impressive.

Certainly, our committee has talked about initial-eligibility requirements—what we can do with these and also progress toward a degree, which you probably are very familiar with as well. So I am going to refrain from getting into these two issues this morning, because you are going to hear so much about them in detail from the NCAA staff presentation.

One of the items that we are looking at seriously, and Brit mentioned it, is new ways of measuring academic performance of graduation rates. We feel that the six-year graduation rate is not a satisfactory measure. We need a more current snapshot of what is actually happening. I am going to pose a few questions here and then come back at the end of my brief presentation to see if you have any reactions to those.

What might be the components of this snapshot? You will think about that. We also feel that whatever reform measures we bring forward there must be incentives and disincentives. That is the way we live in the university and in a lot of other areas. Will there be meaningful penalties? Will under-performing programs change behavior? That is the first question. Would ineligibility of postseason play be an appropriate penalty? Would a reduction in the number of scholarships be an appropriate penalty? I ask you to think of these questions and we will come back to them.

Let me just mention a few things about the baseline study, the economic study. In our initial conversations as a committee, we felt

that, if anything, we had more criticism on a day-to-day basis, we as presidents, athletics directors as well, about the program in its totality, over financial expenditures than maybe just about anything else at this point. Everyone thinks, and you hear the phrase: "It is out of control." Well, to know whether it is out of control or not, really you need to get some data.

Within the committee, in everything that we do, we want data to be able to guide us, to be able to respond to the criticism that will be evident with any kind of change. So, we have a study that is being conducted by an outside group that has specialized in this area. Let me give you a broad brush of what they are doing. They are looking at what is the nature, the scope, the net sum and the distribution of the cost and benefits to universities and their students related to spending on intercollegiate athletics. They are going to use financial, econometric and social policy analyses to look at the means and the distribution of costs and benefits among institutions. They are going to compare overall the particular sports spending and costs and benefits with those of higher education generally, so that they match up against what we do within our own university and how much we spend in our athletic program in relation to all our other expenditures?

We are going to examine the extent to which there is any clear impact on the academic achievement of student-athletes, either across the board or in particular sports, as a result of this spending. We are going to examine the correlations of the possible causal relationships between selected variables over time.

What kind of research techniques are they going to include? To begin with, that is a specialty overall financial analysis, simple statistical comparisons between relative grouping of schools. You will hear mentioned later that there are 21 schools that participated in this very close examination, line-by-line, of the budget, sensitive definition of and a comparison of nonfinancial factors.

What are some of the nonfinancial factors? Let me give you one brief example of probably 30. Are applications on the part of students wanting to go to our institutions where we have athletic programs going up, are they stable, are they going down? Do they have no effect on what we do if they fail? Total econometric analysis as well as selected studies, as I said, of those particular schools. In our November meeting, the Board approved the next phase of that study, and this is the full Board. That phase includes preliminary data analysis to the focus group of 21 Division I member institutions as a refocusing of the study, if necessary. Every single college university on the Board of Directors has agreed to do that. We have also reached out to the others so that we had a good mixture and balance.

We are going to look at Division I membership data collection as well as the analyses, and we are going to try to get all of this completed and have all of the information by October 2002. The motto of our committee is: "If we can do it faster than that, we are going to do

it."

So, if it turns out we can get it done in August, then we are simply not just going to wait until October to look at it. It is expected that consideration of possible legislation can be completed by October 2003.

Let me stop and go back to the questions that I have raised earlier to see if any of you have any brief suggestions on it. Let me repeat that. On the first one, I was focusing on the academic performance of the graduation rate. I am wondering what kind of ideas anyone in this room might want to suggest, because quite honestly, we have got to change the way we measure it and the way it is reported. This is one thing that we will definitely come forward with as an eventual solution. We are just getting hammered, and the information is not clear enough for anyone to understand.

Let me stop and see if anyone has any suggestions on this issue. Okay. The second question had to do with incentives and disincentives. Will meaningful penalty for under-performing programs change behavior? Does anyone want to comment on that? It is a little early at 8 o'clock in the morning and the juices are not flowing yet.

Mr. Harris: Fran, I have a question. Meaningful penalties, could you at least, as the task force has talked about it, could you give me a sense of definition as you have discussed them to this point? Is it as simple as a reprimand or is it more expansive?

Mr. Lawrence: I think it is more than a reprimand for some kind of violation. I think we are looking at probably—I was trying to guide you with those three questions—the loss of scholarships is one of them. I asked about the eligibility of postseason play. That is one that could be very painful to institutions that continue to violate those principles. So we are looking at a number of those. I am sure there are many others.

I would also suggest that members of the task force committee are here. Anyone is free to comment on this issue if they would like. But let me see if any others in the audience want to say something else.

Well, I take it by your silence you are enthusiastic about change. We will come back with change at some point. Thank you. (Applause)

FOOTBALL ISSUES FORUM

Mr. Harris: Thank you, Brit and Fran. I am certain we all look forward to further work of the task force. As I indicated, we are going to move along. I am going to do a bit of shuffling here and shift presenters.

As they come up, you will all recall that we have had various discussions with regard to eligibility for membership in Division I. This has grown to become a process that involves three different tiers of parliamentary maneuvering of committees that have intersected on these various issues.

Broadly stated, is the update. There are three presenters who are joining me up on the stage. They are Charles Wethington, DeLoss Dodds and Greg Sankey. Charles Wethington has been the president emeritus of the University of Kentucky since July of 2001. He has served in leadership roles as the chair of the NCAA Executive Committee and a member of the Board of Directors and a member of the Board of the NCAA Foundation, and the president of the Southeastern Conference.

DeLoss Dodds is the chair of the NCAA Football Issues Committee. He has been athletic director at the University of Texas at Austin for the last 20 years. He has been a commissioner of the Big Eight Conference and chaired in an earlier life—he will tell you how long he has been around—the CFA football television committee. He was an original member of the football postseason committee, and is a former member of the men's basketball committee.

The third presenter is Greg Sankey, commissioner of the Southland Conference. He is a former member of the Management Council and former chair of the I-AA football governance committee. He has served as the chair of the Membership Committee.

Dr. Wethington is going to lead this presentation and give you a status report on the work that they have engaged in these last few months. Dr. Wethington.

Charles Wethington (University of Kentucky): Thank you, Charles. I think most of you remember that during the fall of 2000 there was considerable discussion about the need for an interest in establishing a committee to look at certain football issues. The decision was made that a committee be established and be appointed. The Division I Board at that time, chaired by Graham Spanier, did appoint such a committee.

The membership of the committee is on the screen. I am chairing the committee. The presidents who are listed on the left of the screen are the voting members of this committee.

You will note that LeRoy Davis, South Carolina State University; Carol Harter, University of Nevada, Las Vegas; Bob Hemenway, University of Kansas; Brit Kirwan, Ohio State University; Ed Malloy, from Notre Dame; Lane Rawlins, now at Washington State University, formerly at Memphis; and Joe Steger from the University of Cincinnati, is the group of presidents who are serving on this football issues committee. We did determine to add membership to that committee, even ex-officio membership. You will note on the right the ex-officio members of the group. They are DeLoss Dodds from the University of Texas at Austin; Charles Harris, the Mid-Eastern Athletic Conference; Jerry McGee, Wingate University; Grant Teaff, American Football Coaches Association; Greg Sankey, Southland Conference; and John Swofford, Atlantic Coast Conference. Those individuals comprise this football issues committee.

This group was charged with the following mission statement: "To conduct a coordinated analysis of Division I football, examining

the current state of the sport, to make any necessary changes based on sound data and to ensure the long-time viability of college football."

This group was headed in that particular direction. All of us felt that there were issues that impacted college football. Unless those issues were addressed, the long-term viability of college football certainly might not be as sound as it ought to be for the NCAA and the member institutions. The need for such a study was very definite.

The protocol for the study was established by the chairs of the Division I Board of Directors. At that time, Graham Spanier, the chair of the NCAA Executive Committee, and I chaired the committee at that time, and the chair of the Division I Management Council.

Working with Ced Dempsey and his staff, this group determined what the charge would be to this committee. The areas of study identified for you are the following: We were to look at membership classification—Division I-A, Division I-AA and I-AAA.

We were to look at the governance structure issues, the postseason bowl system; economic issues; and student-athlete welfare and diversity. So properly defined, those were the areas of the study. You will notice one omission from this list. There was consensus and there was a charge from the Division I Board that this not be the group to look at the question of whether there be a football playoff or not. We were very specifically directed to address other issues, not to get into the issue of a football playoff.

Presidential control will permeate these discussions, and those discussions to this point have had that full presidential involvement. We looked at membership classification early on. There was a feeling this was the issue that needed to be addressed most. After some discussion, the committee came to the conclusion that the present membership classification—Division I-A, I-AA and I-AAA—ought to remain in the classification system; but, we ought to focus on ways that we could strengthen the criteria for Division I-A.

We were retaining the existing structure. We were recommending strengthening the requirements for Division I-A and we will consider at the February meeting proposed enhancements that might make it more productive for members to be members of I-A. Greg Sankey will comment more on that recommendation.

We then turned to postseason bowl criteria. Our conclusion is that the NCAA should continue to certify postseason bowls. As you know, there is currently a limit on the number of bowls to be certified by the NCAA. That number is 26. Until there is some recommendation for change, that number will remain in effect. We hope the specific changes for bowl certification will be finalized by the committee at its February meeting. If approved, these changes will take effect for the 2002-03 football season.

We looked at other issues related to the postseason bowl system. We have discussed whether there should be a maximum number of bowls. As I indicated to you, there presently is a maximum. There is

some sentiment for dropping that maximum number and putting in place more stringent certification requirements for the bowls.

We were looking at whether the number of wins should be increased to become eligible for the bowls and if the current level of presidential involvement in the structure is sufficient, particularly at the conference level.

As a part of all of this, we have solicited input from Division I CEOs. We have been doing that through a survey. That data is being compiled. We will see that data for the first time at the February Football Issues Committee meeting. But we are asking a select number of involved Division I CEOs for their input on the current state of college football. We are conducting a survey of student-athletes to find out what the student-athletes experience is, what these students think about bowl participation. We are doing that in this current spring semester.

We spent a good deal of time on financial issues on college football. We charged the Football Issues Committee to explore financial issues and bring back to us some report. They have suggested to us that we give a good bit of attention to an educational initiative targeted at institutional CEOs.

This morning, DeLoss Dodds will make a presentation giving you what in effect we have been sending out to institutional CEOs over this last month to try to get in the hands of the presidents and heads of member institutions the current status of football revenue and expenditures, to give these presidents some good information that will let them make some decisions about the state of college football at their particular institution. We are going to try to get that information in the hands of as many individuals as we can as a start to ensure that there is a good understanding of what the current financial state of college football actually is. Our goal, in summary, is for a meaningful review of the state of Division I football. We will ask for your suggestions, if any, this morning.

We do believe that football is as popular as ever and that it is a significant and meaningful part of the intercollegiate athletic program experience at our institutions. We do believe it is the responsibility of the CEOs to determine where and how improvements can be made.

We should not hide from considering improvements if we think they need to be made. We do know that this committee's effort is to ensure the long-term viability of Division I football. As a part of all of this, we are soliciting input from a broader array of individuals who have some role to play in intercollegiate athletics in our colleges and universities.

With that broad-brush summary, I would like to turn to DeLoss Dodds, who is the athletics director at the University of Texas at Austin, and let him deal with the financial educational initiative that we have underway with all of our member institutions.

DeLoss Dodds (University of Texas at Austin): Charles, thank

you for making me the Big Eight commissioner. I don't remember that detail. After being in Texas 20 years, it is hard to remember all of those kinds of things. I hope it is not on my resume. (Laughter) That is getting me in trouble.

As President Wethington indicated, the Football Study Oversight Committee charged the NCAA Division I Football Issues Committee to explore financial issues related to Division I football. During the past several months, the working subcommittee of the Football Issues Committee had several occasions and received input from numerous interested parties, including our legal counsel.

Members of that subcommittee are myself; Doug Dickey; Bill Muse from Oregon; E. W. Denison from Murray State; Walt Nadzak from The Citadel; and Bill Rowe from Southwest Missouri. The subcommittee's original mission was to formulate various cost-cutting initiatives and to forward specific recommendations to the Football Issues Committee that would go to the Football Oversight Study Committee.

As the subcommittee discussed ways to reduce expenditures related to college football, it became clear that many recommendations would be contrary to the Association's deregulation effort. Members of the subcommittee met with legal counsel to discuss concerns and learned that recommendations related to limits on salaries, staff size and athletic department expenditures might put the Association in precarious legal positions.

As a result, the subcommittee was hesitant to make any recommendations to implement mandatory limits on salaries, staff size or athletic expenditures unless or until legal counsel approved such concepts. In addition to legal concerns, the subcommittee discussed cost-cutting alternatives and encountered argument espousing institutional control and autonomy.

While the subcommittee believes that escalating salaries and facility construction improvements are serious issues, the subcommittee was persuaded by arguments that escalating salaries and rising expenses related to salary construction improvements are not unique to athletics. Institutions across the country are competing for the best educators, administrators and students, and spending significant resources to do so. Members of the subcommittee believe that institutions are in the best position to determine where to allocate its resources.

Instead of recommending mandatory expenditure reductions by imposing limits, the subcommittee recommended an educational effort that would provide information to help institutions make fiscally responsible decisions. The educational initiative envisioned by the subcommittee was centered on individualized financial summaries that would provide institutional CEOs the opportunity to prepare the financial profile of their athletics departments with a profile of other like Division I institutions.

The financial summaries included specific financial information

on football-related revenues and expenses and allowed each institution to review how its expenditures in a variety of areas compared with the spending tendencies of other institutions.

For example, an institution in the third quartile of the athletics budget would be able to compare recruiting expenditures with other institutions in the third quartile as well as institutions from other quartiles. Further, Division I-A institutions in the fourth quartile would have the opportunity to prepare athletic-budgeted expenditures with institutions in the first quartile of Division I-AA.

The data compiled for the educational initiative provides an immediate opportunity for institutions to compare their spending habits with other similarly situated institutions and also may serve as a benchmark for additional studies in future legislative recommendations.

All the information that you will see on the slide was collected from the EADA forms that each individual institution submitted. In presenting the financial data, I would emphasize that the revenue and expense information can be looked at with some skepticism since accounting systems of the universities vary so much.

The information, however, is the best available and gives us a starting point. Hopefully, as time goes by more accurate and consistent information can be given. The survey includes 100 Division I-A institutions and 96 Division I-AA institutions. Each division is divided into quartiles. Based on the 1999 football revenues, means, minimums and maximums are calculated for each quartile and all of the data are for football only. If we could have Slide 1, it shows the average football revenue by quartile for Division I-A and Division I-AA.

I think a significant piece of information is the average revenue of the first quartile of Division I-AA, which is \$1.8 million, is approximately \$250,000 greater than the average revenues of the fourth quartile of Division I-A. Another is that the average revenue for the first quartile for Division I-A is doubled the second quartile, is five times greater than the third quartile, and 15 times greater than the fourth quartile.

Slide No. 2 shows the average football expenses for the fourth quartile for Division I-A and I-AA. Again, a significant point is that the average expense for the fourth quartile of I-A is greater than the average expense for the first quartile of I-AA. The first quartile of I-A expenses are one-half of its revenues and that allows the revenues to be used for other sports. While the average revenues and expenses are provided in Quartiles 3 and 4, the fourth quartile of Division I-A shows an average loss of \$800,000 just in the sport of football, and in the first quartile of Division I-AA, it shows a loss of \$400,000.

The third slide shows Division I-A football average revenues from 1992 to 1999. Revenues during this period of time in Quartiles 3 and 4 are flat or showing little growth. Revenues in Quartile No. 2 increased from approximately \$3 million over this same year period, while growth in Quartile No. 1 escalated from \$13 million to \$21 mil-

lion, or a growth of \$8 million.

Slide No. 4 shows the Division I-A football average expenses for '92 to 1999. Again, Quartiles 3 and 4 expenses remain flat, as the revenue did. Expenses in Quartile No. 2 increased from \$4 million to \$6 million, and in Quartile No. 1, expenses increased from \$6 million to \$10 million during the time frame.

The information shows that while Quartiles 3 and 4 remain flat, Quartile 2 is showing moderate movement, and Quartile 1 is noticing an enormous growth with both revenues and expenses. It appears that the gap is widening.

On Slide No. 5 is Division I-AA average revenues from 1992 to 1999. Similar to Division I-A, the bottom two quartiles remain somewhat flat, while Quartiles Nos. 1 and 2 nearly doubled. For comparative purposes, Division I-A's fourth quartile is included on this chart.

In 1992, the fourth quartile of Division I-A, the revenue was higher than the first quartile of I-AA, and that quickly shrank in the first quartile of I-A and has generated more revenues since that time, while Slide No. 6 shows the average expenses for Division I-AA from '92 to '99.

Quartiles 2, 3 and 4 remain relatively flat while the first quartile remained flat until '98, and then it spiked to almost \$800,000 in that year. The Division I-A fourth quartile is again on the graph and is for comparative purposes. These expenses run ahead of all quartiles in Division I-AA.

Slide No. 7 lists the changes in Division I, as overall revenue and expenses from '92 to '99. A significant factor here is that the first quartile of Division I-A expenses escalated at a faster rate than revenues, while in Quartiles 2, 3 and 4, the revenues are growing faster than expenses. This again indicates a widening gap between the top two quartiles and the other two quartiles.

Slide No. 8 is Division I-AA overall revenues and expenses from '92 to '99. Revenues are growing at a faster rate than expenses in all four quartiles. The expenses in Quartile No. 1 are up 70 percent, while expenses in the fourth quartile show a downward move of 36 percent.

Slide No. 9 lists the average revenues by quartile for Division I-A. The ticket sales in Quartile No. 1 more than doubled the ticket sales in Quartile No. 2. It is six or seven times greater than Quartile No. 3, and the ticket sales are 20 times greater in Quartile 1 than in Quartile No. 4.

On Slide No. 10, it lists the average expenses by quartile for Division I-A. The most notable difference in expenses between quartiles do fall in the categories of football events, in contract services and facilities. In the area of facilities, Quartile No. 1 spends 17 times more than Quartile No. 4.

Dr. Wethington, that is my report and we look forward to questions.

Greg Sankey (Southland Conference): I have the misfortune

this morning of being on the committee that has as its final slide "Q and A." I think that implies both questions and answers. I looked forward to being on the committee that just gets the questions.

Let me go through the first slide of this presentation, which provides a brief historical overview related to the proposals on I, II and III, which is the enhanced requirements for membership in the I-A football subdivision.

Before I begin working through these points, I want to simply provide the perspective on this discussion, especially the recent discussion related to I-A membership requirements. It is possible to go back into the late '60s and find some of the same types of conversation that occurred related to defining football membership, whether it is in the global NCAA or within the upward divisions, specifically Division I.

This current conversation has been generated by discussion among I-AA commissioners approximately three or four years ago and was generated out of the concern related to the continuing migration of I-AA football programs into the I-A subdivision. Those concerns resulted in information presented in the first point of the slides, specifically a dialogue among Division I conference commissioners that was initiated about the appropriateness of existing Division I-A membership requirements.

From there, a group of commissioners representing all of the levels of the subdivision within Division I studied the issue of football membership requirements and forwarded a recommendation to the Division I Membership Subcommittee that I chaired. That occurred in February of 2000.

From that first recommendation, a proposal was introduced and provided to the Management Council. As you may recall, that was the actual 17,000-attendance proposal that was initially approved by the Management Council in April of 2000.

The first point indicates that that proposal was tabled by the Management Council from October of 2000 in light of the oncoming existence of the Football Study Oversight Committee, which was then charged with reviewing the current membership requirements.

When first considering the development of new I-A membership requirements in early 2001, the Membership Subcommittee sought input from conference commissioners via a small task force that included representatives from I-A, I-AA and I-AAA conferences.

This group felt that the first task was to develop a philosophical reference point, which is presented on the second slide. Specifically, the Division I-A membership requirements should be based on sound principles and meaningful standards to measure more than game attendance and ticket sales.

As part of this conversation, our group looked at seven different possible models ranging from a maintenance of the existing I-A membership requirements to a complete elimination of any subdivisional titles and requirements. The group then worked to identify principles

that would aid in the development and enhancement of I-A membership standards. These can be found in successive slides titled "Principles and Criteria."

The first point was that the existing subdivision structure is a valid system for classifying football programs, but requires revision of current membership criteria to better reflect the expectations of a Division I-A football program. It was then agreed that strengthening criteria should be implemented for institutions desiring to achieve and/or maintain Division I-A classification.

The third principle and subpoint states that modifications to Division I-A membership criteria are not designed to exclude institutions but should promote long-term stability, should provide access to the Division I-A subdivision, require program-wide commitment and treat institutions fairly in determining their status.

Continuing under the "Principles and Criteria," the next was to foster and maintain a high level of competition within Division I-A and that members should exhibit a certain level of competition in football, a certain level of resource allocation to football and a high degree of public support in the sport of football.

We looked at a variety of different criteria outside those identified, one of which was academic criteria that might be applied to I-A members. Whether it was academic criteria or some of the other components, our group did not feel it was another set of appropriate tests that could be implemented at this time.

This brings us to the I-A membership standards that have been imposed and have initially been approved by the Management Council. Let me review each of those points. The first is to provide or require I-A members to provide at least 90 percent of permissible maximum number of football grants-in-aid per year over a rolling two-year period. The intent was to require an increased commitment on the part of some I-A members, but still provide the needed flexibility for roster management on each campus.

The second point is to require that a I-A member annually participate in a minimum of five regular-season home contests against Division I-A opponents.

The third point was to require the sponsorship of a minimum of 16 varsity sports, with a minimum of six for men and eight for women. This relates to the issue of program-wide commitment.

Next is to require that annually a minimum of 200 athletes grants-in-aid be offered. There is an additional task that has been added in the legislation and that is the provision of at least \$4 million of athletics grants-in-aid in football. That is an and/or task that is meant to accommodate high-cost institutions that may make a significant commitment to scholarships in I-A football, but may not achieve that number of 200. So that is a program-wide test that is using 200 program-wide or a \$4 million scholarship commitment. Again, that was a program-wide test.

The final component is to annually demonstrate an average

attendance of at least 15,000 in the stadium for each home game. This was identified as 50 percent of the historical minimum stadium size for a I-A member. That proposal is out for comment now. It will go back to the Management Council for discussion and the Membership Subcommittees for discussion of any specific issues identified. It certainly will be a discussion topic of the Football Study Oversight Committee meeting in early February.

The second Management Council review occurs in April, with the potential of the Board of Director's approval also in April, and the effective date of August 1, 2004. The Membership Subcommittee will continue to work on transitional issues that may occur related to this proposal and those that may be identified during the comment period.

One other item that is not on the slide, before you get to those questions and answers, is the issue of defining a I-A conference. That is a task that has been put in front of the Division I Membership Subcommittee. We have made two efforts at creating a definition of a I-A conference, and how to succeed.

However, at the Football Oversight Study Committee meeting, the committee asked the staff to take a step back from the proposals that had been currently identified and work to look at the range of possibilities and evaluate the impacts that might be created by choosing one of those different alternatives.

That information will be provided to the Football Study Oversight Committee in its meeting in early February. We will look to the membership of the subcommittee to move forward in trying to craft that definition. Thank you.

Mr. Wethington: Thank you, Greg and DeLoss. As Greg has indicated, this committee is very active. It has a number of these issues that we hope to be able to take some final action on at the February meeting.

You will note in this presentation there has not been information presented about the student-athlete welfare issues. That is a principle topic on the agenda for the February meeting, along with some of the other topics that Greg and DeLoss talked about.

At this point, Greg indicated that this is a question-and-answer session. We have got some speakers on my right. We have the staff on the left that has been involved in the football issues and the committee discussions thus far. If you have questions that you would like to direct to the committee, please feel free to do so.

Marilyn McNeil (Monmouth University): I guess I have not paid attention or didn't see the part about the \$4 million in the requirements for I-A scholarships that was formerly in dollars in athletic scholarships for football being a requirement for minimum number of scholarships.

Do I understand that to be that if you had \$4 million in football scholarships, Division I-A requirements would require no other scholarship aid?

Mr. Sankey: I misspoke, and I tried to catch myself in that presentation. It is not on the slide and the legislation is a program-wide commitment issue. It is either 200 athletic grants-in-aid program-wide or \$4 million expended program-wide. It is not \$4 million simply in the sport of football.

Mr. Wethington: I might add that the Football Oversight Issues Committee has made a recommendation to the Division I Board. Our recommendation did not include the \$4 million. It did not include the financial alternative.

That is one of the alternatives that is out to the membership for consideration, but it was not the recommendation of the Football Oversight Issues Committee to the Division I Board. I might clarify again that this committee will make its recommendation to the Division I Board. That Board will then take action to determine which of these recommendations go out to the membership. We believe that the Division I Board is the source of whatever power we have, because we are asked to recommend back to that Division I Board. It then gets these recommendations out to the membership for consideration. The recommendation of the Football Oversight Issues Committee did not include the \$4 million reference by Greg Sankey.

Ms. McNeil: I have another question. On one of the earlier slides, you talked about perhaps more requirements of NCAA bowl certification. Has that been elaborated on as one of the areas you might go to. Is somebody looking at that?

Mr. Wethington: I will comment and then ask the other two panelists if they would like to do so as well. I believe it is fair to say that the presidents have expressed some concerns about what they consider to be the proliferation of bowls.

They have expressed some concern about the extent to which institutions are being asked to subsidize bowls. They are concerned about the degree to which bowl participation represents exhibited excellence on the football field during the given year.

Some of these concerns are being talked about. I would like to ask if Greg or DeLoss have any further comment on what we have been considering.

Mr. Sankey: The I-AA guy probably is not the one to comment on that.

Mr. Harris: DeLoss, jump in.

Mr. Dodds: There was some conversation about bowls that do not have the financial ability to pay their bills. There was conversation about an amount of money that a bowl must show as a net revenue before they could be an active bowl. I think that is still part of the discussion that is going on.

Mr. Wethington: I think that is correct. If any of you would like to comment on this particular issue, feel free to do so. This isn't just a question session. If you have comments that you would like the committee to consider, we will be happy to hear them. Are there any other questions for the Football Issues Committee or the staff about

this process?

Charles, I guess we are moving right along. We'll let you have it back. Thank you very much. (Applause)

Mr. Harris: I would like to express my appreciation to the panelists this morning. We have a fairly extensive session coming up on initial and continuing eligibility. I think that in order to facilitate that, I am going to suggest that we take a 10-minute break and reconvene at 9:20.

[Note: The delegates took a 10-minute recess.]

INITIAL- AND CONTINUING-ELIGIBILITY FORUM

Mr. Harris: Ladies and gentlemen, we will begin our session here in just a few moments. We now move to the third topic of our Division I forum—Initial and Continuing-Eligibility Standards. A little over three years ago, the Board of Directors asked the Management Council and subsequently the AEC cabinet to take a look at alternatives for initial- and continuing-eligibility standards.

That led to the development of a group that is partially internal and partially external with significant staff support that is here today to give you a status report on its work. As you can see, there is a full panel here. I will simply introduce them and give you their initial- and continuing-eligibility standards responsibilities. They will take the program from there.

Kevin Lennon is the vice-president for membership services for the NCAA. David Knight is faculty athletics representative at the University of North Carolina, Greensboro, and former chair of the AEC Cabinet. Lee McElroy is athletics director at the University of Albany; Tom Adair is faculty athletics representative at Texas A&M and a member of the Research Committee of the NCAA. Jack McArdle will be joining us. He is professor of psychology at the University of Virginia and is a primary consultant on academic issues. Ellen Perry, associate director of athletics at Pennsylvania State University, and a member of the Management Council; Bill Perkins, faculty athletics representative at Indiana University; and Jim Castaneda, faculty athletics representative at Rice University, and current chair of the Division I Academics, Eligibility and Compliance Cabinet. Kevin Lennon is going to get us started.

Kevin Lennon (NCAA Staff): Thank you, Charles, and good morning to all. I would like to welcome you as well to this important session on academic standards. As you heard earlier this morning from Dr. Lawrence and Dr. Kirwan, this has been an important topic for the task force and the Division I Board of Directors is very excited about sharing with you the latest work of the academic consultants.

I think we are going to have a great morning here. I am looking forward to your active involvement and questions. I do think we have some answers to provide you this morning. I will act as the facilitator for today's session.

I think it would be helpful if we reviewed the materials that you have in front of you. Supplement No. 1 is the list of the consultants. We will talk more about them later this morning.

Supplement No. 2 is a position paper that is supplemented by some data that reflect the current position of the academic consultants, specifically as it relates to the Board's charge of identifying standards that would maximize graduation rates while minimizing adverse impact.

Supplement No. 3 is a copy of the power points that you will see as part of today's presentation, and Supplement No. 4, I believe you will find useful. It is a one-page summary that identifies the current set of standards and those that are being suggested again by the consultants.

We are going to spend time dealing with those documents. We do have a lot of information to share with you and update you on the good work that the consultants have undertaken. But as important is an opportunity to solicit your feedback, not only to help the consultants as they continue to put forward recommendations, but also for the task force and the Board.

It is important to note that there was a great discussion yesterday at the task force level about the goals that they have in terms of academic reform, and that will also be a topic for this afternoon's discussion at the Board of Directors meeting. So your comments and your feedback are extremely timely.

From a format perspective, let me lay the ground rules. We have a lot of information to give you. After my remarks, you will hear from four presenters and from the consultants, who will address the topics that are before you. We will save the questions and answers until you have heard all of the presenters give their information.

At that point in time, you can see how all of the concepts come together and provide meaningful academic reform. I think that would be a better way of dealing with this rather than having questions after each presenter. With the time commitment that we have, we should have plenty of time to have a full hearing of these issues. So that is what we would like to accomplish today. By way of background, it may be helpful to note who these consultants are.

Many of them are present today. There are some in the audience as well. It was in 1999 that the Board of Directors charged and identified a group of consultants to help them look at alternative initial- and continuing-eligibility rules. These are folks who were made up of current and former chairs of the various academic and eligibility cabinets and committees that have long studied this issue. We have a great group of people—a diverse group of people who brought a lot of expertise to the recommendations that they are bringing forward.

It became clear as we began talking about this seamless concept of eligibility of how official eligibility rules need to work with continuing-eligibility rules, that the charge did need to be expanded beyond the eligibility standards. As a part of that, the consultants began to

involve members of a Division I Cabinet subcommittee, the AEC Cabinet, in their deliberations.

It is also important to note that a recent development among the I-A community and the six I-A conferences have brought a very thoughtful approach to the issues that have been a concern of the consultants as well. I think it helped make this a better set of proposals.

The consultants have been periodically reporting to the Board of Directors on their thoughts about the standards. That has been hampered to some extent by certain legal challenges about the fundamental standards from the initial-eligibility perspective. We are very pleased that the recent developments have cleared the way for putting forward these alternative standards that have been long discussed among the consultants and the Board. That is what we look forward to sharing with you today.

As you think about why we are coming at these issues, I would note a couple of things in terms of the reasons for review. First and foremost, this Association has always been committed to discussing the impact of its rules on the young people we affect. That certainly has been true from the initial-eligibility perspective.

We have been long engaged with the great work of our research staff in understanding the impact of what you do in higher education on those who were in the secondary school community. That research has led us to providing some alternatives that we intend to suggest to you today.

There also has been a bit of frustration, if you will, with a lack of predicted validity of using high-school performance for predicting college graduation. You work with many young people and know that something significant happens during that collegiate experience that helps dictate whether a person is likely to graduate or not. There has long been frustration that the way our initial-eligibility standards have been used have not helped us to predict as well as we would like. That was another catalyst for considering alternatives.

It also was a concern regarding the impact of our standards on certain minority groups. A part of the Board's charge was to identify alternative rules that will address the adverse impact component of our standards. As Dr. Kirwan mentioned this morning, we have recent graduation-rates data, particularly when you look at one population, black men basketball players, in which there are some concerns about the direction those graduation rates are headed. That provided an additional catalyst for the Board's charge.

They then came forward and wanted the consultants to come back with a set of proposals for our consideration that will do a couple of things. One, we want to maximize graduation rates as best as possible, while at the same time minimize adverse impact. I believe the suggestions that we are giving to you today for discussion is true to that charge.

Let me provide a very quick overview and whet your appetite

about what you are going to hear today. You are going to hear a concept of a seamless model in which the initial-eligibility rules work in conjunction with the continuing-eligibility rules.

That has not been the case with our current set of standards. We are excited about sharing with you how they can work together in a thoughtful manner, in a way that we believe will not only help improve the adverse impact but will certainly improve graduation rates.

In terms of maximizing graduate rates, you are going to hear a lot of focus on the continuing-eligibility rules and how that is the true place where adjustments can be made to improve graduation rates. We are going to talk about raising the expectations for our student-athletes, so that we can better move them along the line of progressing towards a degree.

We are going to talk about the need to create certain incentives and penalties to help assure that we have better recruiting decisions and better matches of the students with the general profile, and that these incentives work together to ensure that all parties—the students, the coaches, the institution—are working together towards that student's success.

We also want to talk about changes in graduation-rate methodology that was referred to earlier to make sure we are capturing all of the academic successes that we know are going on in our various campuses, including those students who transfer from one institution to another and actually achieve their degree.

You will hear some information on how we think we can best minimize the adverse impact. That is an area where you begin to focus on the initial-eligibility standards. We are going to focus with you on the best ways that we are considering now of addressing that.

Some of that relates to a full extended sliding scale, some of that relates to where you actually place the scope of your line or where your coordinates are in terms of what SAT score you need with what GPA. Are they set at the appropriate levels?

Some of it will deal with increasing the access to aid, perhaps for groups that currently are not eligible to receive aid based on their academic performance. Those are some of the things we want to talk about today.

Finally, there might be a desire to increase the core-course requirement with the understanding that by increasing those expectations of academic performance in high schools from a core perspective, that perhaps some of the marginal students would be better prepared when they come to our campuses.

As I mentioned, today is a critical opportunity for feedback. We will go right into that this afternoon and take your feedback to the Board of Directors. The thought is that this April we will be providing some legislative proposals for the Management Council and the Board's consideration related to initial-eligibility and continuing-eligibility standards.

I think there may also be a desire now to move up discussions about some of the incentives and penalties so they can be considered in concert with the standards issue. We will do so this coming April. It will give you an opportunity through your spring and summer meetings at the conference level to have a discussion about these standards with the thought that perhaps we could come back in October of 2002 for a vote by the Board of Directors.

The issues regarding graduation-rates methodology and time demands, which I will talk about in the end, are on a little bit different track. But we will continue to put those proposals together and bring those to the Board and the Management Council for their first official look in October 2002.

Although we have some time, time is still of the essence. These are critical proposals, as you heard earlier today from the Board's task force. We are very excited by the opportunity to share with you what the consultants have developed in more detail.

With that, I will turn this over to David Knight to take it away.

David Knight (University of North Carolina, Greensboro): Thank you, Kevin. The academic consultants are proposing new academic regulations for Division I that represent significant changes from current practice. We thought it would be useful to the membership to know something about the approach that the consultants are bringing to this project.

The presidents of the NCAA Division I Board of Directors have consistently maintained that academic regulations in Division I be predicated on their effects on graduation rates. The consultants have consistently held to the point of view that participation in NCAA competition is a privilege and not a right.

Eligibility in the freshman year is earned by academic attainment in high school; eligibility thereafter is earned by academic attainment in college. Currently, under Proposition 16, high-school academic parameters are used to predict college graduation.

The consultants are proposing new regulations that depends on collegiate academic performance to predict college graduation. We are able to propose this fundamental change because we now have access to new data dealing with the academic performance of Division I student-athletes that heretofore have not been available.

Beginning in 1994, the NCAA research staff has maintained what is called the Academic Performance Census. This database is a longitudinal study of the academic careers of over 11,000 student-athletes. Each is a Division I scholarship athlete. Each is or was enrolled in our school and competed under our rules. We know the classes they took, the grades they earned and the eligibility status of each while he or she was enrolled in our schools. We now have six-year graduation data on these 11,000 students.

We believe that this information in the aggregate allows us to know the look of the Division I scholarship athletes who are academically successful as measured by graduation. We believe this database

provides better information on which to model new academic regulations than any available to us before.

Using collegiate academic data to craft new academic rules essentially puts greater reliance than heretofore on what we call continuing-eligibility rules. It also permits alternative uses of high-school academic parameters in setting initial-eligibility standards.

You will hear more about this later as these new ideas are pieced together with initial- and continuing-eligibility regulations and what seems to be called the seamless academic regulations. Our present rules for continuing eligibility come into effect after the second semester, and it is the case that student-athletes can be minimally in compliance with our current rules and never attain an academic record that will allow them to graduate.

Our newly proposed rules should begin this impact earlier in the careers of student-athletes. The consultants are aware that the first year in college puts enormous academic and competitive pressure on student-athletes. We want to recognize these pressures by setting realistic requirements on performance. But our data strongly indicate that freshmen need to acclimate early to these pressures because many individuals who eventually are unsuccessful academically are those who get into academic trouble early and are unable to turn their situations around.

We believe that our statistics inform us about levels of academic achievement that successful student-athletes obtain at various points in their academic careers and that we can identify sets of academic mileposts that are attained by the successful individuals.

We believe that we can craft a set of continuing-eligibility rules that will include these mileposts and targets to be reached by student-athletes at various points in their collegiate careers. It is important to point out that the consultants believe that new regulations should include grade-point requirements that will put student-athletes in position to graduate at most institutions.

We should point out that this represents a major change in our rules. If a student-athlete stays in school long enough to exhaust eligibility, the individual would have to attain a grade-point average that would make him or her eligible for graduation at the institution.

Because of this aspect of our proposed regulations, we think that a new label should be attached to our new regulations. Our current eligibility rules emphasize eligibility more than academic attainment. We think that our new rules would better be called progress toward graduation rules in order to recognize the newly emphasized intent to graduate rather than merely to maintain eligibility.

The consultants want the membership to understand that whatever the final details of our new rules happen to be, that these details are data driven by information contained in the academic performance census. In the case of the freshman year, we are proposing that student-athletes be required to complete a minimum of 24 semester hours or 36 quarter hours with at least a 1.8 grade-point average

before the start of the second academic year.

This standard was arrived at based on our data indicating that student-athletes who achieved this minimum level of performance after their first year have a reasonable chance of graduating. You see some numerical data on the screen relating to two parameters—grade-point average and hours completed—and these data indicate that two-thirds of those who had less than 24 hours at the end of the first year leave school before the end of the second year. Also, roughly two-thirds of those who have less than a 1.8 grade-point average at the end of the first year leave school before the end of the second year.

This is the kind of information that can be gleaned from the academic performance census and it shows how this information can be used to suggest new regulations. The details are not yet complete, but are entering completion for the sophomore, junior and senior years.

The consultants will propose that the student-athletes complete a minimum of hours toward their degree program with specified grade-point average before the start of the third, fourth and fifth academic year. It is anticipated that the percent of degree requirements would be increased relative to our current standard, the 25-75 percent rule, and that these new standards would be based on an optimization of the likelihood of graduation.

New percentage of degree requirements are likely to require student-athletes to meet a 40-60-80 degree rule with grade-point average required to graduate to be achieved by the third academic year. The consultants are still discussing whether term-by-term requirements need to be implemented.

If we ratchet up the progress towards graduation rules, it is clear to the consultants that student-athletes at our member institutions will have a greater likelihood of reaching yearly academic requirements if our institutions are encouraged to admit student-athletes who closely match the admissions profile of the student body generally.

I will turn it over to Jim Castaneda to talk about initial eligibility.

James Castaneda (Rice University): Thank you, David. I would like to put in perspective a little bit the 1999 date mentioned by Kevin as to the formation of the consultants group, and then allude to the subsequent augmentation of this group to include the full membership from the AEC Cabinet of the Initial- and Continuing-Eligibility Committees.

I think this is a significant step, because very shortly after the inception of the AEC Cabinet in 1997, initial eligibility received a charge from the Board, which included maintaining or enhancing graduation requirements while minimizing adverse impact.

We considered that this was a very paradoxical change, a very difficult one to address. We wrestled with it for a while, and then, of course, everything was interrupted by the Cureton case, during which we were mandated not to propose any changes in existing

rules.

I think, however, that we used that time wisely in receiving and considering a great number of reports from our Research Committee. All of these reports had the intention of trying to show ways in which we could perhaps deal with this dual charge.

What we have come up with now is work that represents active consideration of change as of May 2001, when the Cureton case was finally resolved. What you are going to be hearing today from us is not presented to you as firm recommendations.

We have been considering a number of areas with different parameters, and we truly hope that the input that we will receive today from you and in writing or e-mail, or however you choose to give it to us after this meeting, will help us in our final deliberations.

One of the three issues that I have been asked to speak about is a proposal by the consultants to increase the number of required core courses from 13 to 14. Currently, the student-athletes average something like 18 core courses. So we feel that even though a change from 13 to 14 would certainly not be very much of a challenge for the average or above-average group, it would be perhaps a significant increase when viewed in context of the people who may already have trouble meeting the 13 core-course limit, i.e., specifically people in football and basketball. We feel that the addition of a 14th core course, which would probably not at this point be designated but would, nonetheless, provide additional background and strength for the at-risk group coming into play in college athletics.

The other part of the Board charge of minimizing adverse impact on minority groups is the area that I would like to address at this point. The consultants continue to view, as David pointed out, the importance that a student-athlete earn the right to participate in intercollegiate athletics.

We continue to support the use of test scores along with grade-point average. We have been shown by the Convention and by our research staff that is the best predictability to obtain a combination of grades and test scores in an area in which a lot has changed or evolved, however you wish to put it, in the area of whether or not we use a test score.

I am going to ask to put up Slide No. 21. Slide No. 21 shows quite clearly that Proposition 16 involved a cut-off score on the upper left-hand side of the score and on the lower right-hand side of the GPA.

When the Cureton case was considered by Judge Buckwalter, one of the points of contention was that the numerical cutoff limits assigned by Proposition 16 were arbitrary. There was research done, of course, but nonetheless, people have asked and people have not had satisfactory answers to the question of why is 820 all right and 819 not all right?

If you look on this chart at Area No. 2, which is the area of the partial qualifiers, I will give an anecdotal comment on this point. The partial qualifier with a grade-point average of 3.00 and a test score of

720 has a 45-percent predictable chance of graduation, while someone in one of the areas of Area 4, who is eligible with a 2.50 and an 820 SAT, has only a 38-percent predictability of graduation.

In other words, the research has given us insight into some of the problems related to the use of arbitrary test scores. There has been considerable discussion of extending the cutoff score completely.

Now, if we could have Slide 12. Slide 12 is in your materials. Slide 12 shows a sliding scale without a cut score on the test score side, but with a continuing cut score of 2.00 on the GPA. I am sorry, we need Slide 11. There has been discussion of whether or not we dare go to a complete sliding scale and elimination of the cut score.

With the sliding scale, as you know, you must have a comparable test score and GPA. If you take, and it is not on the slide, the people who are in the region of the upper left-hand side who did not meet the 7.8 partial qualifier score and who did meet the GPA requirement, you have a total of 30 people out of a total group of 43,000.

In other words, there is virtually no one who lives in that region of extremely high GPA and test scores under the 720 limit. Therefore, this, to me, certainly minimized the risk of eliminating the cut score if you go to the complete sliding scale.

This is not anything that we are presenting to you as a final recommendation. It is something that is under consideration. My comments about the predictability of graduation for some partial qualifiers as opposed to some current qualifiers and to the extremely small population of that area way at the top certainly allay fears of the possibility of going to elimination of the cut score in the test score.

The other aspect that we have to consider is aid to nonqualifiers. The Minority Opportunities and Interests Committee several years ago when we were discussing means of increasing access, came to us with a proposal that, in essence, said if we maintain the current sliding scale requirements for admission but allow aid to nonqualifiers, that would go a long way to improving the access available to minorities.

The only thing I can say on this is that aid to nonqualifiers has been something under consideration. I tend to think that at this point, there is less enthusiasm for it. There is an alternative proposal that creates another line beneath this, the current line for a proposed sliding scale, which would allow a certain group to receive aid. But again, that is something on which we would like to have comment and something on which we have not come to a full conclusion.

The other point with regard to the sliding scale that I would like to make is probably old hat for most of us. Proposition 16, as you know, has in terms of relative difficulty of meeting the requirement, a doubly stringent rule for the test score as opposed to the GPA.

This is one of the things we have been wrestling with, and it is one of the things that is still under consideration. A cut score, if there is one below 820, has been proposed at 620, which would be the same standard deviation as the test score. But I think that there is also

some feeling that if you go to 620, you might consider going all the way. One of the reasons for going all the way is simply for legal sensibility. If you go all the way, with an extremely small population of students in that area, you cannot be accused of placing an arbitrary limit.

From a legal point of view, this is something that is important to the Association. With that, I will turn the floor over to Lee McElroy, who will talk to you about incentives.

Lee McElroy (University at Albany): Thank you, Jim. It should be noted that the consultants are early in the process of working on incentives and disincentives with the knowledge that we are going to the incentives for purposes of this morning.

This forum is one of the many opportunities to hear from the membership on this important piece of the academic reform package. Current legislation provides many incentives for student-athletes to achieve academically. For example, student-athletes who enter our institutions as nonqualifiers, as Jim just talked about, are not permitted to compete or receive athletically related financial aid.

Enrolled student-athletes who failed to meet our continuing-eligibility standards are not eligible to compete. These student-athletes' focused incentives have been a bedrock of academic legislation for many years. However, incentives and penalties that are in force for institutions have been less evident.

As the consultants have considered this issue, there is support for building a set of institutionally oriented incentives. For example, limiting the number of initial counters is one example of an institutional base for recruiting and retaining student-athletes on our campuses.

The consultants have discussed some guiding principles related to incentives and penalties that include the following:

- Students must earn the privilege of participating in intercollegiate athletics.
- Decisions regarding student-athletes' participation in continuing activities should rest with each member institution.
- Institutional penalties should impact the sports program that fails to meet identified standards, not the entire athletic program.
- Institutional differences must be considered when establishing academic criteria that could result in penalties or disincentives.
- Penalties should impact coaches in an effort to change the culture surrounding poor student-athlete academic achievements.

The consultants plan on having recommendations to the Management Council and also to the Board of Directors at the October meeting for discussion and review.

The consultants welcome your comments and thoughts about appropriate penalties and disincentives today and throughout the next several months. I would now like to turn it over to Tom Adair.

Thomas Adair (Texas A&M University, College Station): Thank you, Lee. My job is to bring you up to date on where we are with the

graduation rate reporting methodology. I think that we all agree that the present reporting mechanisms required by the federal government are flawed. Some of the problems are listed there on the screens. They underestimate the success of our student-athletes, because they don't count those who leave institutions while still in good academic standing. The present rate does not account for transfers into the institution and does not account for the nonqualifiers.

Another problem is that the data are delayed considerably because of the six-year period. The consultants are working on the way new rates are reported. Of course, this will be in addition to the federal rate until that can be changed.

This new rate would take into account student-athletes who leave your institutions and go to another institution of higher education if they were in good academic standing or academically eligible at your institution when they left. It would also include the transfers into your institution and it would include nonqualifiers.

Other issues under discussion: Should the rate include all student-athletes or just those on scholarship? If someone leaves the school while academically eligible and doesn't transfer, they are included in the calculation of nongraduate and the collection of this rate will be mandated.

Another idea, an idea that has come from another group working on a number of these issues, is one the Division I-A conference group has suggested. We are considering now what is called a yearly academic success rate. This rate would take into account such things as eligibility, retention and graduation. In essence, it would give you an annual report card of the success of the athletic program in these areas.

This, if successful, would be most suited to be applied to what Lee was talking about with the incentives and the penalties stage. The other issues that we are considering, I have already mentioned the federal mandated rate, and so unless that can be changed, we will have to continue to do that rate in addition to the ones we are proposing.

I would like to mention in closing that Division II is working on these same ideas and we do have coordination between the divisions. I met with the Division II working group in hopes that we can come up with a similar idea or ideas from both divisions. Thank you, Kevin.

Kevin Lennon (NCAA Staff): Thank you, Tom, and I thank all of the panelists. We have given you a lot of information. If you will give me about 10 more minutes, I want to try to pull this all together. For those following along, you can turn to Pages 13 through 15 of your power point presentation. For those who like the one-page version, Supplement 4 will do the same thing.

I want to share with you in its entirety what has been suggested and do it by comparing what our current standards are with what you have just heard. Let's begin with the initial-eligibility requirements.

No. 1 is the important principle that we are going to use high-school academic variables differently. Rather than using them to predict college graduation, we are going to use them to predict academic success as measured by these freshmen and sophomore year outcomes.

You have heard David and I speak to that. You are hearing a suggestion of moving core courses from the minimum of 13 to 14. It is important to note as well that there is a sense that that is just the start of the increases of looking at core courses, that additional work would be done to see whether 14 really is the appropriate level and that there's a commitment to continue to examine that to make sure we have better prepared students. What you see being said today is a minimal increase of 13 to 14.

No. 3 continues to be the same. Student-athletes determine their own test scores, what they need based on their own performance out of high school. How well I do in high school will then dictate which particular test score I need to achieve on the sliding scale.

There is discussion, as you heard from Jim Castaneda, on Point No. 4 about where we should put a test score if there should be any cut at all. There is a desire to continue to retain the 2.00 grade-point average cut today, but as you heard, the appropriateness of the test score is something we want to talk about.

We will have some speakers at a later point in time dealing directly with the test score issue. Obviously, No. 5 is that students be required to continue to graduate from high school. We then look at the incentive and penalties piece for initial eligibility, which remains consistent. Students earn their eligibility as freshmen by meeting the minimum standards.

Point 2 is one that we want to talk about. Currently nonqualifiers are not receiving athletic-related financial aid. Is there some interest in the membership of increasing that pool of aid-eligible students?

No. 3, there continues to be a desire to have students earn back seasons of competition similar to what is currently in place with our nonqualifiers. There are additional changes to consider. I noted that additional increases may be discussed and presented in 2005.

I think that is a misprint on my part. I think that it is probably more realistically 2004 that we would agree to come back again looking long and hard at the appropriateness of core-course levels, et cetera. That is a place where we can make a meaningful difference.

Finally, you need to think about this as it relates to initial eligibility. The Board and task force need to give their approval to all of this, but the thought may be to actually implement this with an effective date in the fall of 2003.

You would then allow students in the fall of 2003 to become eligible as freshmen by either meeting the new standard that is being suggested or the current standard. Most of you who have been around know that is traditionally how we have handled changes in standards. You can grandfather or give people opportunities to meet the

new standard. But by 2005, all students would be required to meet the new initial-eligibility standard.

Let's turn some attention to continuing eligibility—the fundamental concept that David Knight talked about. We no longer talk about continuing eligibility, we talk about progress towards graduation rules.

Point No. 2, our current rules of our continuing-educational standards, has worked independently of initial eligibility. We are recommending a seamless model where they work together with the eligibility requirements.

Point No. 3 is a critical one. Rather than basing eligibility on a year-by-year performance in which students can get themselves well simply by performance in one academic year, we are talking about doing eligibility or progress towards the degree based on the student's cumulative academic performance—one that places a freshman year expectation, 24 semester hours, 1.80; and one that ratchets up the percentage of degree requirements from a 25-50-75 to a 40-60-80.

It has the added components that by the start of your junior year, your grade-point average needs to be that grade-point average required for graduation from the institution. With the incentives and penalties, the students continue to earn their eligibility by making progress towards a degree each year.

You have heard Lee talk about the identification of additional incentives and penalties that are critical. I want to emphasize this point. From a consultant's perspective, those are critical if we are, in fact, to really achieve improved academic performance in graduation as we ratchet up these continuing-eligibility rules.

There is some thought that without appropriate incentives and penalties, when you ratchet up continuing eligibility in the way we have talked about without incentives, making a better recruiting decision without reasons for engaging all parties in a more meaningful way in that academic success in retaining those students, we may not see an improvement in the graduation rates. In fact, it may go the other direction.

That is a critical piece that again will be fleshed out in the coming months. I know the Board of Directors is keenly interested in hearing in April about these particular recommendations.

Finally, from an effective date perspective, we would again look at the fall of 2003. Those freshmen who come in that year know they are subject to the 24-hour and the 1.80, and that from that point on, they would be then subject to the 40-60-80 requirement. The recommendation going forward to the Board is that currently enrolled student-athletes who are already on campus after the fall of 2003 would be grandfathered.

They would continue under the current set of continuing-eligibility requirements that are in existence. If you do the math, that plays out to about 2007 before you have all of your students subject to the

continuing-eligibility requirements.

The final thing I would note, and we have talked a little bit about these, are other areas to consider. Do we continue to want to require a designation of a degree by the junior year? I think it is safe to say in No. 2 there needs to be discussion about the use of summer school hours, what we do prior to initial enrollment, particularly for those of you who have students who need remediation. As we look at the standard we have suggested, are there things that we need to do in terms of those remedial hours of what we currently require? Is the number appropriate? Does it need to be changed? How might we treat that summer bridge period before initial enrollment differently to make sure we achieve academic success?

Through four years of college, is the 75-25 percent rule an appropriate requirement when we are trying to move people more aggressively towards degree attainment? The GPA requirement is ratcheted up a bit. The freshman year we are suggesting the 1.80. At the end of the sophomore year, it is a GPA that requires what you need to graduate from that institution. That is a ratcheting up from the current 90 to 95 percent rule.

Finally, as you heard from David Knight, there is discussion about the appropriateness of the term-by-term certification standard. Again, no decision has been made on that. That is a lot of information. I think we are done from the panel's perspective here.

Charles, if it is okay with you, it is probably an appropriate time to take questions from the audience. I would love to hear from you.

Jo, why don't we start with you?

Josephine Potuto (University of Nebraska, Lincoln): I actually wanted to start at the back end with regard to the area of waivers. I want to preface this by saying I will support wholeheartedly the enhancement of academic standards in an effort to increase graduation rates, and so does my institution.

But I am concerned about situations that will fall within the literal language of new legislation, but outside the intent and purpose of that legislation. I believe that the one clear foreseeable consequence of the new rule is that there are unintended consequences, some of which are not foreseeable.

Having gotten burned a couple of years ago with initial counters and whether waivers would be appropriate, in the interest of full disclosure, I want to try to create a little legislative history that appropriate circumstances could be accommodated by a waiver.

One area, and this is by way of example, of concern I had is with regard to progress towards graduation if a student-athlete wants to change a major mid-program. One part of the concern is, I think, that we want to encourage rigorous majors and students to follow their interests without concern for this program to be such that our interest will change.

We know that a lot of students, not student-athletes, change majors once or twice, or maybe three times before their academic

careers are over. Again, by way of example, the current legislation with regard to extending to get a sixth year in which to do four years of eligibility is interpreted to mean both years have to be out of control of the student-athlete.

In this situation, if I were a student-athlete and decided to change majors as many of my colleagues did when I was in college, too start as a pre-med or other science major and then take quantitative courses, and then a lot of us then became English majors after that, which I can say as an aside, was a little offensive that they thought that was an easy way out.

But for those sorts of situations, I am not suggesting by any means that the committee should be looking at drafting legislation to cover exceptions. I think that is probably not feasible. A lot of the situations will not be ones that anybody is going to be able to predict in advance.

I would like some assurance from the people who are working on this, who are the proponents of the legislation, that they recognize that there may well be appropriate circumstances that may later be considered.

One of the thoughts I will throw out is it might be helpful if members of either the consulting group or the working group actually served on—the language will change—the continuing-eligibility subcommittee to consider waivers.

There would be some assurance that any waiver that is granted would be consistent with the purposes of it. This is really again an attempt to get some clear legislative history on the record.

Mr. Lennon: That is a very good suggestion about the continuity. I would share with you the current way it works in changing degrees. What we are interested in is if you would have been eligible had you remained in your original degree program.

The concern has always been that you are shopping majors just to retain eligibility. My sense is that from all of our discussions that that standard would continue to apply. Obviously, there needs to be additional thought as you ratchet up to 40 percent what other types of students may have mitigating circumstances that would require a waiver. I think those are things that the group will be committed to look at.

Ms. Potuto: I am happy to hear your response to that particular example, but I am looking for a little more assurance that there is a recognition that the unintended consequences mean that there may be subject areas other than the ones I gave—that at least a subcommittee would be receptive to looking at that to see whether the literal application of the rule is leading to a consequence that really is not within the purpose of an intent of the legislation.

Mr. Lennon: I think the committee will acknowledge that.

Ms. Potuto: Is there unanimity on that?

Mr. Castaneda: Yes.

Ms. Potuto: Good. Thank you.

Chris Pope (Murray State University): I have a question for the committee with regard to continuing eligibility. The proposals will impact five-year degree programs.

At Murray State, the college catalog lists programs as such that there is always an ever-increasing push for increased enrollment.

Mr. Knight: I think there should be a way to make that a tractable problem. I think that right now, as you said, we are close to proposing 40-60-80-100 percent. In other words, 20 percent of your degree requirement in a five-year period.

I think that within that rule, we could work out the problem that you are talking about. With respect to other waivers and other unintended consequences, in the list that was made we didn't talk about, how to handle remediation programs?

I think we can find out what the facts are with the pressures that are put on these proposals in the form in which they are now. You will notice they are not yet in the final form. We can do that with waivers and instruct waiver committees on what to look for that would constitute a successful waiver. I think we can handle that. We are not finished with these proposals.

Jeff Orleans (Ivy Group): I wonder whether the group sees any particular issues with regard to students, whether they are qualifiers or not, who begin this post-secondary education in junior colleges and then transfer in. That population has raised issues for us in trying to write rules and not have them circumvented in some way or another by folks who begin in junior college.

I am just wondering if there are any issues that the group sees in making sure that these students have on the one hand the right opportunities and on the other hand that the standards are clearly applicable and can be followed by both people and by the colleges.

Mr. Lennon: Does anyone want to take that one? In general, the thought is that the current rule requires that when a student comes in after two years in a junior college they be basically on track with their peers.

My sense is that the committee continues to be supportive of that concept. There is not going to be a lessening of the junior year standard because you come from a junior college. Your point is a good one. That needs to be clarified with the junior college community along with additional hurdles that this is going to create in terms of transferable hours and what is acceptable to a degree program.

I think the philosophy is once you get into the four-year system, you are on track with your peers and that obviously you begin recruiting perhaps a little bit differently from the junior college pool to make sure that happens.

Is that fair enough?

Unidentified Delegate: I have a question about the data, which are compelling. I appreciate having the presentation on it. My understanding is this is with the most recent graduation data, which was the '94 class. Is that correct?

In terms of reviewing the data and getting a feel for the prediction, it was the '96 incoming class that came under the administration of the standards with the consultants. If you were to go out on a limb, how much would you think the data would change between the '94 class and the '96 class? Also, did the consultants have an opportunity to look at sports-specific data, particularly football and basketball? Would you say this might be a different predictor outcome if you were to look for specific data?

Todd Petr (NCAA Staff): The first part of your question about graduation rates, the predicted change, a move from 48 to 16 was four percentage points, you get somewhere like 62 overall for all student-athletes at the Division I schools. I am not sure that we will see the whole four-point increase. My guess is that would be a maximum that we would see when the '96 data come around. But that is a guess.

The other point was do we see differential predictions for different sports, is that it? We have looked at it that way and we have not found that to this point. I will ask Jack McArdle to perhaps comment a little more fully on some of the details of that analysis.

Jack McArdle (University of Virginia): Let me say with my colleague, Tom Paskus, he did most of the analysis of the data. You realize we didn't meet 11,000 people who gave us the data. We wanted to take one minute in that interest for your contributions to this information.

The '94 data we had were not selected in the same way as the earlier rules. That was an opportunity for us to evaluate what would happen when these rules went in. The rules went in whether they were more stringent than not. What we have found was exactly as Todd mentioned, we expect higher graduation rates.

We also expected a larger adverse impact on the minority populations in that same shift. That is the balance that we have tried to work with. That has been what we have tried to deal with when we were examining some of these new rules.

Both of those outcomes are likely to be seen in this next set of data. When we look at men's basketball and football, there is a very large minority population. So the time impacts are very large there when we see the shift from '94 to '96.

We don't expect, though, that it will be any different from '94 to '96 in the predictability of their graduation rates from their high-school grades and high-school test scores. This has been the phenomenon we have seen for 12 years now, consistent prediction difficulties.

The outcome is that we select some of these variables that can be taken out. But the pattern has always been about the same. We have a large minority population and a large and different pattern of test scores and grades. We don't find any difference in the predictability, but differences in some of these outcomes.

Alan Hauser (Appalachian State University): I have got a question. On Page 7, when you talk about the core courses. In terms of these 11,000 students who have been surveyed, I think we all under-

stand the spirit of moving from 13 core courses to 14 core courses.

But I wonder if there is anything statistically related to the data that would suggest a significantly higher percentage of academic success for students who come in with 14 core courses as opposed to 13?

Mr. Petr: That individual, that one unit moves the data on nuance—we can't see it in the data that will make an immediate difference in performances. It is not there. There is certainly a relationship between a number of core units taken across the whole scale and academic success that is there.

It is not as strong a predictor as high-school grades, the actual GPA, as opposed to the number of units taken. But there is definitely a relationship between that and academics. The test scores have also shown that the more core units you take the better your academic performance, both on the test and in the school.

So there are these relationships. The move from 13 to 14 specifically, I don't think we can say means two percent percentage points or something on graduation tests.

Mr. McArdle: I wanted to add one other point to that. Todd has said it very well. The increase of core courses probably has made a very big difference. That is the introduction of core courses instead of non-core courses.

Going back a decade, that probably has made a tremendous difference in some of the academic outcomes. The move from 11 to 13 also appeared to make some differences, a small difference, but some kind of difference. At that same time, students seemed to be able to adjust from 11 to 13 in other kinds of core-course requirements.

This particular strengthening of the academic standards seems to be something that high-school students can do. The average for the NCAA recruiting pool is now about 18 core courses on the average, so the students are certainly responding to this particular stimulus.

At the same time all of the students are doing this, the minority students are also doing this. This is not something that seems to be creating a large impact. At the same time, it is a benefit. It moves in that direction. So I think that the committee, as they saw this pattern, wanted to make a move in this direction.

The primary motivator at this point is 13 to 14, but the general tendency has all the properties of increasing academic standards. At the same time, it does not have a significant recruiting impact.

Alan Hauser (Appalachian State University): Do you have any idea of approximately how many student-athletes come in eligible and have the minimum of 13 core courses?

Mr. Petr: There is a slide here that represents what happens in the sport of football. Currently, I think those student-athletes who meet the GPA and the test score, but miss on the core course, is 1 percent of the students.

The change that we might see is in the data on the screen now. You can see in the sport of football. These are folks who may miss other things as well. As Kevin Lennon has told you, there is only 1

percent who missed the 13. In football, it is 2.1 percent overall. You can see the difference between 2.1 and 3.1.

If we move to 14, then overall it jumps to 2.7. Then you begin to see greater changes in the sport of football itself. One thing we say about the data, the students were not held to the standard. As Jack mentioned before, in the data that we had, when we moved from 11 to 13, we seemed to see great adaptation on the part of students to this kind of change.

Unlike changes in test score, we don't see the same kind of adaptation in the number of core courses taken. If you put a standard out there, it seems there is some adaptation that they will attempt to make.

Mr. Hauser: Thank you.

Pat Britz (Texas Tech University): The increase from 13 to 14, in which academic discipline will that be? Has there been any discussion regarding that?

James Castaneda (Rice University): There has been discussion, and the status of that at the moment seems to be to allow as much liberty as possible. There's the feeling that—as Todd and Jack have stated—that the increase in core courses perhaps diminishes the counterbalance of other courses they might take and would be beneficial.

The initial stages of my work with initial eligibility included involving the high-school community—the principal, the guidance counselor, and so forth—throughout the country.

We received such wonderful input and cooperation from them. We also achieved the benefit of a greater sense of solidarity and cooperation from them. I think that within the parameters of allowing great liberty on this, that we would like to elicit the cooperation of the high school in helping us to assign a specific area to these courses.

I think that we can expect the initial reaction from the high-school community to be negative—that we are again dealing with what is being done in their bailiwick. I hope that answers your question.

Mr. Britz: That helps. Thank you. Regarding the nonqualifiers earning the fourth year back, has there been any discussion about those individuals earning that year back before the end of this fourth year?

For example, maybe if they earned 50 percent toward their degree after their second year, they could earn that year back at that time as opposed to waiting until the end of their academic year.

Mr. Lennon: This is a good question, Pat. There has been some preliminary discussion about whether a nonqualifier who hits that new benchmark at that sophomore year, whether that would help that person, because they know they will get that extra year back at that point in time.

No final decision has been made on that, and no recommendation is even being formulated at this point in that regard. That will be

picked up over the next couple of months. Obviously, if folks have opinions on that, that will be the type of thing we would like to hear from you.

David Knight (University of North Carolina, Greensboro): I think there has been some movement on the part of individuals, at least among the consultants and other groups that we hear from. They were initially reluctant to take up the notion of giving back a fourth year of competition.

If the continuing-eligibility rules are strengthened in the way that we are talking about, I think that there was reluctance to give a fourth year of competition.

Mr. Britz: Thank you. Finally, I would just like to applaud the group. Having worked on both sides of it now, the work that all three groups have put together to develop this is tremendous. I think it is a huge benefit to the membership.

Mr. Lennon: Thank you, Pat.

Mr. Harris: Kevin, you worked for the committee. Will you tell us how the remedial courses will be treated in counting? Can you be a little more specific on that?

Mr. Lennon: The core requirement issue, as you know, is 12 semester hours in the first year. I think that the discussion is whether we need to adjust the 24-hour rule to either include those 12 remedial hours or whether you exclude the remedial hours. In addition to the remedial hours, you need to pick up 24 other hours to your degree program.

That obviously raises the issue of what we do in the summer prior to enrollment and the summer following your freshman year. Is that fourth-semester window, if you will, adequate time to say we are holding you to the standard of your other peers on your campus who do not need remediation?

If you need to take courses of remediation, do you have to do that on top of what we have said? No decision has been made, Charles. I think that is a significant route that we are going to need to talk about. I understand that the I-A conference group, which again put together a very thoughtful proposal in this regard, particularly has reflected that we should reduce that number to six as acceptable towards the 24 hours. That would put a student-athlete about at the 15-percent mark prior to the start of their second year as opposed to the 20-percent mark. That is a way of addressing that issue.

That is another point, Charles, where I think we would be interested in your feedback, because we have got to work that remedial issue through.

Tom Paskus (University of Denver): Let me just add to that. We also have had some discussion of whether or not the 40 percent at the beginning of the third year would need to be modified and take into account any remedial course work. That is, permit the student-athlete to earn remedial course work and count it in their first year, and perhaps need some time to work that off. So, while we have made no

decision on this, we have talked about the possibility of only having a 35 percent or 37.5 percent requirement at the end of the second year, that would go on to the 60 and 80 percent after that.

Mr. Harris: Let me ask a question for clarification. I think I get it from looking at the data. It looks as if one falls behind in their third year, there is very little, if any, potential to regain that eligibility. It looks like the data suggest that you come in at such a marginal level, you were not going to do it anyhow.

Is that where the committee is headed?

Mr. Lennon: I guess I would just share with you that part of that underlies all we have talked about in regard to a better match of profiles of student-athletes with the institution. To be NCAA eligible does not mean you are a good fit for every Division I campus.

So that is a part of the academic equation. Hopefully, that student would have success early on. The thing is, if a student falls short either way, it doesn't mean that. It would be our hope that there is going to be incentives for that institution to say I am vested in making sure that doesn't happen. What are the things I need to do to help that student? Maybe it is not playing spring football for that particular student. Maybe that is an increased expectation of what you are going to do in the summer to get yourself back up to your peers.

We think there is behavior culture adjustment that can be made that will hopefully lessen that impact. But you are right, you can't just become eligible based on a one-year performance after you have done poorly the first year. You have got to get yourself back up with your peers. This is the ratcheting up that we are talking about.

Mr. Castaneda: I would like to interject a factor here. That is coaches. I don't think that any of these proposals can be successful unless they involve and expect the cooperation of the coaches. I think we have all seen that we are dealing with minimum level. We also are dealing with a large pool of potential recruits.

I think that we need to encourage and insist that our coaches recruit people who are more likely to meet the profiles we are talking about and more likely to be successful. If we get people attempting to go around the rules and to bring in people who are not going to meet the profiles we are talking about, we are not going to have the success we hope for.

Tom Hansen (Pacific-10 Conference): I join in commending the group and the others who are working in this area. I think we are making some great progress. I wanted to add one point. We have talked about incentives and disincentives, both of you have and the other groups. The Division I-A presidents are looking at this, also.

I believe we should be careful to include incentives, because as we do in our enforcement program, we have lots of ways that we penalize. But we ought to have some success stories in this area because there will be some wonderful success stories with these new approved standards.

We ought to give ourselves an opportunity to recognize those. It

will be very hard to find acceptable penalties for lack of success. It will be then doubly hard to find acceptable incentives. Let's try to find the incentives so that we do have those successes.

Mr. Lennon: Thank you. That is an excellent point.

Sondra Norrell-Thomas (Howard University): I, too, want to commend the group. We have for years been talking about continuing education. When it came on the floor, it went down. However, we continue to see the disadvantaged student-athletes not meeting the core-course cutoff.

If the 14 core course is not designated, and if you look at that and you do put a 14 core course on there, the largest percentage of people who will be affected will be your black football players. It is 4.5 percent, which is the highest percentage level of not meeting the qualification.

Mr. Lennon: The only thing that I would note there is that it could be addressed to the effective date. You heard from Jack and Todd that the core-course patterns are something that we think can change, more so than test score improvements, for example.

What we suggested, Sondra, is that in 2003, a student could continue to be eligible by meeting the current rule or the new one, and that by 2005, you would expect all students to present the 14. Some argue that is not ambitious enough. I would hope that by setting forward, you raise the expectations for the high-school community, that people, particularly the African-American community as we noted there, will be able to raise and meet that particular new standard with that kind of a time line.

Mr. Petr: Again, that is something that goes in, and as it goes in, we'd obviously monitor all of these for their impact.

Mr. Harris: The question is, with regard to the moving up the number of core courses, Kevin, you made the comment that suggested that maybe you would be back in a year or two. I don't know that, but perhaps to 16 is not out of the question. So I don't hold you to that.

I wonder how actively you and the committee will engage the high-school community so as to help the students in this matter?

Mr. Castaneda: I would tend to think that our experience is so positive in dealing with the high-school community on the national level that that would be absolutely a requirement for our procedure.

Kathy Jones (Southern Illinois University): I have a follow-up question about the increase of the core-course requirements. My concern is that since we don't have statistical evidence that indicates that the move from 13 to 14 increases the predictability of graduation, are we not going down the same impact road that we did with the arbitrary test-score cutoff? Are we confident that the courts are not going to challenge us on this issue?

Mr. Lennon: That is a great segue. Not only do we want to pick up that issue in the test score perspective, but I know that one of the other critical areas that you are thinking about, and the consultants

are thinking about, is the implication of the 820 cut score. I asked Elsa to talk a little bit as well about the test-score component and her thoughts about retaining a cut score in the test score.

Elsa, if you could talk about the core course and maybe just follow through with the test score, that will be helpful.

Elsa Cole (NCAA General Counsel): As most of you know, the Cureton case was a challenge to the minimum test-score requirement for a case brought by a class of African-American student-athletes. The lesson out of that lawsuit is that any requirement that was put in place has to have what the court referred to as a manifest relationship to the goal sought.

The court recognized that it was appropriate for the NCAA to have a goal of improving graduation rates, but felt the evidence that we brought forward at that time to show why now the test score was set at the level it was, was inadequate to show that, in fact, it had this manifest relationship.

That is the test we have to meet any time we go forward and look at it and use that requirement. Certainly, the data that we have from the research go a long way in explaining why it may be more appropriate to have a different test-score requirement than the one we have today.

The core-course requirement, which you referenced a moment ago, is a new situation for us. The evidence that we have of efforts to meet that particular requirement is that it appears that the population is able to do that and it has a very minimal disparate impact of harm to the African-American population as in the original lawsuit.

That is something we will have to continue to monitor and examine as we go forward, because that would still have to be something that we would have to show the court the manifest relationship between that particular set of core courses and efforts to achieve the graduation rate.

Josephine Potuto (University of Nebraska, Lincoln): I have a follow-up to that question and the question before, and in regard to increasing the number of core courses. We had a discussion in our conference about the impact on some of the high schools, particularly in economically deprived areas, as to whether increasing that requirement would put a burden on those high schools that don't have the resources to offer the number of courses.

They may not have access to the information about what is required. I wonder the extent to which the committee is considering that access as well as what the data will show as to the impact of additional core courses.

The other part of this question relates to the question about the core courses and graduation rates. If I understand it, the data you are working on is the core courses showing first-year performance. The graduation rates then will rely on data developed with regard to what occurs during what we now know as the progress to degree.

My question is to Todd and to Jack, and to people who do the

research. I assume from now on the research is going to be recorded that way. The initial-eligibility research we are looking to is going to focus on first-year performance and that the graduation rate numbers are going to focus, if not exclusively, primarily with regard to what is going on after a student arrives at that institution and will allow us then to focus better on.

If the predictions don't prove out, we will have a better idea of what it is we need to fix, and we are not going to fix initial eligibility if the issue is what is going on in graduation.

Mr. Petr: We will continue to look at both. You have to review the eligibility with the impact on early college success, and then continue to look more to graduation issues as a general theme for what we are trying to do. We will probably provide the information to people in both contexts.

Mr. McArdle: The reason we moved towards some prediction of first- and second-year behavior was because it was the most accurate predictor of graduation, because you have been there by the second year to be able to graduate by the fifth or sixth or fourth year.

We wanted our initial-eligibility representation to be as accurate as possible. This turned out to be the best way to do it. It was taking steps in stages. That first stage was the relationship between high-school behavior. Will you make it by the second year in some standing that will be set up for later graduation.

It is not forgotten. It is a piece along the way. It is a stage along the way. I think we reported, both of us, as much as we could. The information we have now does give us a full record and we have done both now. The piece that may be a little confusing is as reported by the people.

The number of core courses taken in high school is a strong predictor of later graduation. It is just that the high-school grades overcome this. That is the strong relationship between the grades that people have and the number of core courses that they take.

So it is hard to split these apart. When you do the grades, the grades are the most predictable. We are talking about 13 and 14. We can't find any additional prediction of graduation. It is not that 13 or 14, those people don't look different, it is just that other variables help us to deal with that.

So there is no additional validity information on this at this point. We do think that there is some validity to the structure for core courses to begin with. The core courses provide the necessary educational framework for the student to be prepared for college. So that is why this seems so illogical.

As far as adverse impact, as was pointed out, it does have its impact right now. We have seen that mobility here is possible. It is less possible in schools that have ethnicity in this respect. There is no question about it. So, as Jim said, we will have to work with the schools before that is made. That information is all available, and we will try to present it as clear as we can.

Mr. Lennon: To answer the first part of your question, impact on each school, I think we have a better system of educating them in terms of the new expectations. We have learned a lot since the clearinghouse started getting that word out.

I don't think I see many high schools that would have a hard time saying we don't offer 14 core courses. We don't see that. The key will be to get these students to take those appropriate courses. If that helps relieve some of the concerns that you have, we can work cooperatively on the effort of how we get that done, particularly if we look at increasing the number beyond 14. I do think that will best serve us.

Robert Baker (Texas Tech University): I would like to revisit the junior college transfer issue. There are many complex issues associated with getting a degree in college. One of them has to do with how the faculty set up the standards for various degrees, and with the junior college transfer that is a real problem. If the university doesn't have a lot of electives to permit that student to count those toward a degree program, they are going to come in behind in many programs.

That is a problem with Texas Tech University. There is not some mechanism for them to make up those issues and degree plans, especially if it is going to keep Texas Tech able to recruit those athletes. I don't know how much that is an issue to all the universities.

I know many universities don't recruit many junior college athletes. But there are many that do recruit them. Basically, you are dictating what you have to have, unless you are effectively communicating with the junior colleges how they can take courses that are going to affect their degree plan.

So it is a very complex issue. It needs a lot of communication, just as you talk about how we need to communicate with the high schools. I think if you are going to raise the standards of junior college people and have them start out with 40 percent of the degree plan in place, whenever they come into the system, there has got to be some effective communication with the junior college.

Mr. Lennon: That is a good point.

Marilyn McNeil (Monmouth University): I know when we made this presentation to the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee, they were taken a little bit back about increasing the core courses and perhaps franchising students from taking a broader high-school grouping of courses.

Having a junior in high school myself, I worry a little bit, although I understand the average is 18. What happens to art and art appreciation? I know you are going to talk to the high-school community. I know that the Student-Athlete Advisory Committees were taken by this. I thought it would be good to allow students to have some choice in high school.

Mr. Lennon: You raise an interesting point. I think we just have to make the judgment going to 14 denies the student the opportuni-

ty to take those other classes and becomes a balance that you have to get up to 17 or 18. You are probably right. That is a judgment that has to be made. That 14 really restricts a student's opportunity for other classes.

Fran Lawrence (Rutgers University): I just want to make a comment about the question raised earlier about the junior colleges. A few years ago in New Jersey, we looked at the art of the system in Maryland and realized if we adopted it for all of the four-year institutions that it would change our lives, especially change our faculty lives as well as the students interested in transferring.

I would suggest that you look into that if you don't have it in your state, because now the students and the counselors in the community colleges go online and find exactly what they need to transfer to any of our campuses, and we have over 50,000 students.

Our relationship with the community colleges is such that we just started last year a dual admissions program where we admit and they go to their community college, whatever community college they have, and by their junior year they transfer and they follow those core requirements that they can find online.

If you are not familiar with ours, there may be another system throughout the country, but it has changed our lives. I suggest you might want to check into it.

Mr. Lennon: All right.

Nona Richardson (Valparaiso University): We deal with a number of international student-athletes. I don't know if we are in a position to answer this question. They are not mentioned on the core-course accomplishments. They have other standards.

You seem to be raising the bar for our student-athletes in this country, but their bar seems to maintain the same height. Are they looking at any changes for the international student-athlete other than what we have for our student-athletes?

Mr. Lennon: That is an area of ongoing discussion. I think you are right, as the academic expectations change for domestic students and initial enrollment, we need to do the same for the international student-athlete. I would note that the students with learning disabilities, which we entered into a consent decree with a while ago, is going to have to continue to be addressed.

Those are the things that will go right in front of the consultants. They have it on their screen right now. They will be looking at that. If you went to a full sliding scale, we engaged in an exercise system some time ago to see what it meant from an international perspective, how we would go in and change the specific country-by-country requirement. So, some initial work has been done but more is yet to be done.

I don't think anybody else has any questions to raise, so I will turn it back to you, Charles.

Mr. Harris: Thank you. I would like to express my thanks to Kevin and the other presenters. We had three forum topics. We still

have all of the presenters from the earlier sessions who were here. I believe this is a very useful dialogue that we have had a chance to participate in this morning.

I will also tell you from the perspective of the Management Council, as well as, I believe, the Board, that we'll spend a good time on this task force training, that these items will be fast-tracked. I will encourage you to share the information you have heard this morning and to take full advantage of this request to provide them with additional feedback if you have it, because I expect you will see all of this fairly quickly in a fairly concise form.

Having said that, and in reviewing the agenda, unless there are other questions, this forum has reached its conclusion. I thank you for your participation, and I wish you well.

I would remind the Board of Directors and the Management Council that lunch will be at 12:15 in the Indiana Ballroom, A and B. We are adjourned.

[The Forum was adjourned at 11:05 a.m.]

■ Division II Business Session

Monday Morning, January 14, 2002

The Division II Business Session was called to order at 8:08 a.m., with Division II Presidents Council Chair Patricia Cormier, Longwood College, presiding.

OPENING REMARKS

Ms. Cormier: Good morning. Let me hear a "Good morning."

From the Floor: Good morning.

Ms. Cormier: I want to make sure you're awake. Remember, I can see your eyes from up here.

The 2002 Division II Business Session will come to order. I am Patricia Cormier, president of Longwood College in Virginia, and chair of the Division II Presidents Council. I want to welcome you all to the 96th annual NCAA Convention.

I think Indianapolis would like to be known as the amateur sports capitol of the world. Some of you might take issue with that, but I think that's what they think.

I would like for the other Division II Management Council and Presidents Council officers to stand and be recognized at this time: Presidents Council Vice-Chair, Bernard Franklin, chief executive officer for Virginia Union University; Management Council Chair, Jerry Hughes, athletics director, Central Missouri State University; Management Council Vice-Chair, Lisa Colvin, senior woman's administrator, Southern Arkansas University.

I'd also like to take this opportunity to introduce the other individuals joining me on the dais. Please welcome Larry Fitzgerald, faculty athletics representative of Southern Connecticut State University, who will serve as our Division II parliamentarian. We do need to give him some applause because he's already been working. (Applause)

Members of the Division II governance staff are: Mike Racy, who is the chief of staff for Division II; Jan Brown, assistant chief of staff for Division II; and Ruth Reinhardt, executive assistant for Division II.

Our legislative experts are also with us today. Jim Johnson and Bob Oliver of the NCAA membership services staff will be available to answer legislative questions and issues that may come up during the course of the day.

Finally, let me introduce the other NCAA staff who are with us this morning. Dave Pickle, who is our NCAA News representative. He is now at the media table. Missy McCracken, membership services staff; and Aaron Robinson, governance staff intern, are in the voting pit.

Let me call your attention now to some general announcements and to our two Convention publications. First, the Convention Program that you received at registration. On Pages 17 and 18, you will find the program for today's Division II Business Session. The second publication I want to mention is the 2002 NCAA Convention Official Notice. It's this green book, which you should have received in November.

In Appendix A, the blue pages in the Official Notice, on Pages 93 and 94, you will find a list of the 39 legislative proposals and one amendment-to-amendment that will be considered during this business session.

We will attempt to follow the business session schedule as it's listed on Pages 17 and 18 of the Convention Program. We will recess at about noon for lunch, which will be served in the Capitol Ballroom, and we will conclude our business and adjourn the session no later than 5 p.m. today.

Please return from lunch by 1 p.m. ready to continue the afternoon session, which means that you then can get out earlier, perhaps.

Please note that on Page 4 of the Convention Program, there are minor corrections to some of the Division II proposals. These are technical revisions that do not alter the original intent of the sponsors.

Also, refer to the procedural issues handout. That includes corrections that did not make it into the program.

One official procedure that we must dispense with is the need to adopt the Convention Notice and Convention Program before beginning our business. If we vote to accept the Convention Notice and Program, we will vote on the proposals in the order that they appear in those publications. If you wish to move to reorder a proposal, now is the time to do so.

I also want to point out that by adopting the Official Notice, you are adopting the incorporation of interpretations described in Appendix B, Pages 97 to 101; the noncontroversial amendments in Appendix C, Pages 103 to 123; and the intent-based amendments in Appendix E, Pages 153 to 156.

These interpretations and amendments all have been approved by the Management Council and Presidents Council during the past 12 months. We will not discuss any of them individually unless you move to do so.

I will now ask for a motion to adopt the Official Notice and the printed program of this Convention so that we may proceed with our work. Do we have a motion?

From the Floor: I so move.

Ms. Cormier: A second?

From the Floor: Second.

Ms. Cormier: All in favor, raise your paddles; all opposed. The motion carries.

Roberts Rules of Order provide that procedures therein may be superseded or replaced by an organization's own traditional and cus-

tomary procedures. This Association has a number of such legislative requirements and procedures. Several of them are reviewed in the introductory section of the Official Notice. In addition, you will find in your Official Notice several appendices in the blue pages that list procedural information that may be of assistance to you.

NCAA Convention procedures are designed to ensure fairness and equitable treatment for all members and to expedite your work as delegates. I will not take the time now to explain all the parliamentary procedures used to ensure fairness, but I would remind the delegates that we fully intend to apply these procedures throughout the business of the Convention.

There are certain procedures we employ in attempting to use our time wisely and efficiently. Let me briefly review those.

First, we will use the voting machines for roll-call votes. All other votes will be handled by paddles.

I will attempt to eyeball as many votes as possible. There are also others here who are going to help me. I will call for a machine count only when there is doubt as to whether there is a majority.

Although the delegates have a right to ask for it, I ask all delegates to refrain from calling for a machine vote count unless one seems necessary to determine the disposition of the issue. If a delegate intends to debate an issue during the business session, we ask that you be at one of the microphone locations and be prepared to speak when the motion has been made and seconded, or as soon as the previous speaker has concluded his or her remarks. The microphone numbers will be utilized to recognize speakers. Delegates will be limited to speak to no single motion more than twice. If I see no one at a microphone, the vote will be called as quickly as possible.

Please remember that NCAA procedures require all votes to be by paddle or electronically, not by voice or show of hands. You need to have your voting paddle and your wireless voting unit with you during this session. The electronic voting procedures will be reviewed prior to taking our first electronic vote. The voting and the speaking privileges for NCAA Conventions are set forth in NCAA legislation and are summarized in the introduction to the Official Notice. I will not repeat them here.

I would ask that you identify yourselves by name and affiliation whenever you address the Convention. Those delegates wearing Convention badges with ribbons are permitted to speak. Those without ribbons are visitors and may not participate, other than as observers.

Let me also review briefly the window of reconsideration opportunity. After we complete the Presidents Council grouping, I will call for a motion to reconsider any of the proposals that have been voted on so far, for example, Proposals 6 through 29. All motions to reconsider Proposals Nos. 6 through 29 must occur at that time, during this window of reconsideration, for the proposals in the Presidents Council grouping.

Please note that some proposals have immediate effective dates for implementation. For such proposals, the immediate effective date must be considered first, followed by a vote on the merits of the proposal. If an immediate effective date is defeated, and the proposal is adopted, the effective date will be August 1 of 2002.

We have a court reporter, Barbara Griffith, to prepare a transcript of this business session, so I would remind you again to identify yourself and your institution or affiliation whenever you speak.

PRESIDENTS COUNCIL REPORT

I'd like to spend a minute on the Division II Presidents Council report. This year we decided to take a different approach regarding Convention reports, including the annual reports delivered by the Presidents Council, the Management Council and the Budget and Finance Committee.

In an effort to be more efficient with our time, and also to keep you awake, I don't see anybody's head nodding off yet, we decided to produce a written version of the reports that you traditionally have listened to the morning of the business session. Each of you should have received a copy of the Division II 2001 yearbook. I hope you have all received this. If you don't have a copy, we'll make sure that you get one before you leave. I hope that you find this written summary both informative and interesting.

Bernard Franklin, our vice-chair, will now deliver a few brief remarks about the yearbook. This is Bernard's last Convention as vice-chair, although he will be staying on the Presidents Council at least for another year after he steps down from this role. He has done a truly outstanding job as vice-chair. Not only has he done a magnificent job of managing this budget and projecting out the future for us in a very responsible way, but he is also an exemplary member of a number of our committees.

Please join me in welcoming Bernard Franklin to the podium. (Applause)

Bernard Franklin (Virginia Union University): Thank you, President Cormier.

My name is Bernard Franklin, and I am the president of Virginia Union University. I served as vice-chair of Division II's Presidents Council and chair of the Division II Budget and Finance Committee.

I would like to take a few minutes to highlight the Division II 2001 yearbook. As President Cormier mentioned, this yearbook will help us conduct our business session more efficiently, and it will provide you with written reports to take back to your campuses. You may also find the yearbook on the NCAA Division II Web site.

The yearbook is designed to provide information about the work of the Division II governance structure as well as highlight achievements of the division's membership. Also, following the welcome by the chairs of the Management Council and Presidents Council, a copy of the Convention schedule has been provided for your convenience.

A brief overview of the yearbook includes the following sections: In the Division II identity section, you will find a summary of Division II facts and figures. This document provides a snapshot and profile of Division II membership. The Division II newsmakers section highlights some of the accomplishments of Division II student-athletes and administrators. We all should be proud to have these individuals as a part of our family. There is also a chronological summary of all the Division II headlines from The NCAA News this past year.

The Division II Strategic Plan 2001 accomplishments summarizes the strategic achievements in Division II this past year. I am pleased to announce that every objective set last year was met. You may recall that the goals and priorities identified in the plan were developed in 1999. This year, the Management Council and Presidents Council will review the goals and priorities outlined in the plan to see if they need to be updated or modified.

The next two sections are reports from all Division II committees and project teams. These reports summarize the work of the committees over the past year as well as provide an outlook on what issues the committees will be working on in 2002.

Student-athletes have an important role in the Division II governance structure. To enhance communication between the Division II Student-Athlete Advisory Committee and the Management Council, each summer these two groups meet for two days to discuss critical issues in Division II. The section regarding the Management Council/Student-Athlete Advisory Committee summit is a commentary written by a former Division II SAAC member and current NCAA staff member, Crissy Kaesebier, about the evolution of the summit and how it has become an invaluable and efficient tool in the Division II governance process.

The next two sections are the Division II strategic plan priorities and the Division II budget for 2001-02. I would like to call your attention to the fact that the NCAA Executive Committee authorized a \$5 million contribution to the September 11 Disaster Relief Fund on behalf of all NCAA member institutions. Also you will notice that the division's current membership trust balance is \$4,396,000, which is 30 percent of the division's revenue allocation. At the end of the year, Division II is projected to have approximately \$6,280,000 available for future strategic initiatives.

The long-range budget planning section provides a forecast of projected revenue and expenses for the next five years. The Budget and Finance Committee will use these projections as it evaluates funding new strategic initiative requests.

This fall, all Division II chief executive officers, athletics directors, commissioners, faculty athletics representatives and senior woman administrators were sent a survey regarding their perception about Division II's identity. The raw results are provided in the yearbook for your review. The Division II Management Council and

Presidents Council will use this information to develop an effective plan to promote Division II.

The next two sections provide information about two important Division II programs: The Strategic Alliance Matching Grant Enhancement Program and the Division II Degree-Completion Scholarship Program. I encourage all of you to review the information about these programs and contact the listed staff if you have any questions.

Finally, for quick reference, the dates for all future Division II NCAA championships have been provided.

I hope that this yearbook will be a useful tool for all of you. Time has been set aside at the conclusion of our legislative business today for questions and comments you may have about the yearbook and the work of the Division II governance structure.

President Cormier, that concludes my report.

Ms. Cormier: Thank you very much, Bernard.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

We're now going to begin our voting on the 39 Division II proposals, starting on Page 2 in the Official Notice.

Proposals Nos. 1 through 5 are part of the consent package that is intended to be voted on as a group.

The Division II Presidents Council has identified Proposals Nos. 6 through 29 as those it believes are of particular interest to Division II chief executive officers and has included them in the Presidents Council grouping this year. After considering the Presidents Council grouping, we then will consider the rest of the legislation, beginning with Proposal No. 30. Proposals Nos. 30 to 39 will be considered by paddle vote. Before we begin the actual voting process, we need to take some time to review the voting units you are using today. First, let me explain how to cast your vote using these particular voting units, for those of you who have not used them before.

[Note: Voting procedures were explained.]

As we begin voting, I would like to remind you to please state your name and institution for the record when you are recognized by the chair at one of the numbered microphones.

We're going to begin with the consent package. This is a paddle vote. This is Proposals Nos. 1 through 5. Proposals Nos. 1 through 5 make up the consent package and will be considered as a group, unless there is an objection. These are proposals that the Management Council and the Presidents Council have determined to be generally housekeeping in nature.

Proposals 1, 2, 3 and 5 have immediate effective dates; however, they are included in the consent package that is intended to be voted on as a group. A separate vote on the immediate effective date for these proposals will only be necessary if a motion is made to withdraw a certain proposal from the consent package and consider it separately.

Consent Package

Paul Engelmann (Central Missouri State University): On behalf of the Legislation Committee, I move the Consent Package, Proposals 1 through 5.

[The motion was seconded, and the consent package was adopted.]

Ms. Cormier: We are now ready to move to Proposals 6 through 29 that make up the presidential grouping. Proposal No. 6 is a roll-call vote. Please reference the interpretations on this proposal that were distributed to the delegates on the legislative summary sheet. Note that this Proposal No. 6 must be moved and seconded, before amendment-to-amendment No. 6-1 can be considered.

Membership—Voting Conference Requirements

David Brunk (Northeast-10 Conference): On behalf of the Membership Review Project Team, I would like to move Proposal No. 6.

[The motion was seconded.]

Madam Chair, as most of us are aware, the requirements to become a voting conference in Division II are extremely easy to satisfy. Yet, there are many valuable benefits available once a conference earns such status.

Under current legislation, a group of schools can simply form some type of alliance, with very little organization and minimal commitment to championships and sport sponsorship, and at the same time, enjoy automatic qualification, Management Council representation and enhancement fund access.

This proposal at least guarantees we have a commitment to sport sponsorship, scheduling and championships in a way that will ensure that all conferences are conducting these types of activities similarly and have the same commitment in those areas.

As a member of the project team and as a commissioner, I urge your support of this proposal.

Robert Vowels (Southern Intercollegiate Athletic Conference): On behalf of the Management Council, I would like to move Proposal 6-1.

[The motion was seconded.]

Ms. Cormier: This will be a paddle vote on the amendment-to-amendment. We're going to do that first and then go to the roll call.

Mr. Vowels: Thank you. I totally agree with the comments of my colleague and support Proposal 6. It is important to make this amendment so that conferences have the autonomy to select sports that will be used to satisfy sports sponsorship minimal requirement.

When we adopt Proposal 6, it will establish a minimum sports sponsorship requirement of 10 sports per conference. The minimum can be satisfied by counting five sports for men and five sports for women.

Amendment 6-1 provides an option for conferences, where the

minimal sponsorship requirement can be met with four sports for men and six sports for women.

This amendment-to-amendment is very, very important. I urge your support.

[Proposal No. 6-1 was adopted.]

Ms. Cormier: We will now vote on Proposal 6, which is a roll-call vote, as amended. Remember that you just amended this. Now we are going to vote on Proposal 6.

Mr. Vowels: Thank you. As I stated earlier, I agree with my colleague's comments regarding the importance of strengthening voting conference membership requirements, specifically sports sponsorship requirements.

Membership benefits, like revenue distribution, qualification for championships and governance representation, are all tied to conference affiliation. When it comes to the benefits and services, we place significant importance on conference affiliation in Division II. We need to ensure that all current and future conferences operate consistently in regard to sports sponsorship. We need to increase the minimum requirement to 10 sports and develop parameters related to how sports count toward that minimum.

We can no longer permit an alliance of institutions to have only a couple of its members play one play-off and crown a champion and count that as a conference sport. Under the current rules, that is possible.

I urge you to support Proposal 6.

[Proposal No. 6 was adopted, as amended by Proposal No. 6-1, 251-10-0.]

Ms. Cormier: We will now move to Proposal No. 7. This is a paddle vote. There will be two votes on this one. We must vote first on whether to establish an immediate effective date for the proposal, then we will vote on the merits of the proposal, as amended, to include an immediate effective date.

Member Conference—Eligibility

Kaye Crook (Coker College): On behalf of the Membership Review Project Team, I would like to move Proposal 7.

[The motion was seconded.]

Over the years, we have taken action on several proposals to establish provisional membership requirements for Division II institutions. However, we have not established similar requirements for new conferences.

As we all know, membership benefits and privileges in Division II are based, in large part, on conference membership. Therefore, the project team agreed that new conferences shall be required to complete some type of provisional membership period and an educational program prior to being eligible to receive the benefits of conference affiliation. This proposal establishes such a requirement.

The specifics of each year of the program will be developed by the

Membership Committee in conjunction with the Division II conference commissioners. The Membership Committee, as with the provisional member institutions, will administer and evaluate the program on an ongoing basis.

This is a positive step for the division and for the conferences that apply for membership. It will better prepare such groups for membership in Division II, similar to how the current program benefits provisional institutions.

I urge your support of Proposal 7.

[Proposal No. 7 was adopted, effective immediately.]

Membership—Provisional Member Exploratory Period

Kay Schallenkamp (Emporia State University): On behalf of the Membership Review Project Team and the Division II Presidents Council, I move Proposal 8.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal 8 establishes a one-year exploratory period that a prospective member institution must complete prior to being eligible to apply for provisional membership.

The project team agreed that one of the goals during the moratorium should be to develop requirements that would ensure successful completion of the provisional membership program by deserving institutions. The exploratory period concept is one requirement that accomplishes this goal. This will give an institution, after filing an official declaration to apply for membership in Division II, at least one year to evaluate whether Division II is the correct affiliation, develop and implement a plan to meet minimum membership requirements at the time of application, and at least a year to become familiar with the NCAA legislation related to Division II requirements in areas such as eligibility, financial aid and recruiting.

This is a tool that without question will require prospective members to be better educated and informed. It is a positive enhancement to the current provisional membership program.

In addition, the exploratory period will provide the Membership Committee with a system to plan and prepare for future provisional member institutions.

I urge your support of Proposal 8.

[Proposal No. 8 was adopted, effective immediately.]

Provisional Membership—Rules—Compliance Progression

Ms. Cormier: Please note that Proposal No. 9-B will be moot if Proposal No. 16 is defeated.

Joan McDermott (Metropolitan State College of Denver): On behalf of the Membership Committee and Management Council, I would like to move Proposal 9.

[The motion was seconded.]

While it is important for institutions to be provided an educational period in order to learn Division II rules relating to recruiting,

eligibility, financial aid and playing and practice seasons, the Membership Committee believes that a commitment to sports sponsorship and a minimum level of financial aid should exist immediately.

Over the past few years, provisional members have joined Division II while only sponsoring a total of four or five sports, and in some cases, less than that.

The Membership Committee agreed that this is not the profile of an institution that matches the profile of most of our current members. In many cases, provisional institutions have not satisfied minimum contest and participant requirements until year three of provisional membership and have had as few as one or two countable sports in years one and two. A commitment to sports sponsorship should exist at the time of application, and that commitment should be maintained throughout the provisional membership process.

I urge your support of Proposal 9.

[Proposal No. 9 was adopted, effective immediately.]

Membership—Annual Limit on Provisional Members

Charles Dunn (Henderson State University): On behalf of the Membership Review Project Team, I would like to move Proposal 10.
[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal establishes what is arguably the single most valuable tool in managing the growth of Division II. Once institutional requirements to apply for provisional membership are enhanced and established, some of which exist already, and some of which we're establishing today, it's still critical that we have some method of managing the rate of growth. This proposal establishes this method.

We may have a number of institutions that meet the minimum requirements for application. If so, we need to be able to manage growth so that we can also manage and adjust our budget, championships access and strategic plan simultaneously.

As a Division II CEO, I welcome new members into Division II; however, I'm concerned about us becoming a division of some 400 institutions in a very short period of time and jeopardizing the benefits, services, programs and opportunities that we all currently enjoy.

With the tool in place to limit the number of institutions that join each year, we will not be jeopardizing such benefits, and we'll be able to systematically absorb our newest members.

I urge your support of this proposal.

Mary Gardner (Bloomsburg University of Pennsylvania): On behalf of the Management Council, I would like to speak in support of Proposal 10.

I certainly agree with President Dunn on the importance of managing growth. I would also like to point out the practicality issue of provisional classes that are too large. As a member of the Membership Committee, I personally have experienced the frustration of attempting to educate and evaluate provisional classes of 30

or more institutions. It's virtually impossible.

With an annual limit on the provisional class size, the member institutions themselves will be better served and educated, and the Membership Committee will be able to do a much more effective job of evaluating these institutions at the end of each year.

I urge your support of Proposal 10.

[Proposal No. 10 was adopted, effective immediately.]

Provisional Membership—Eligibility

Clint Bryant (Augusta State University): On behalf of the Membership Review Project Team, I would like to move Proposal No. 11.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal establishes new requirements that must be satisfied in order for an institution to be eligible to apply for provisional membership in Division II. Specifically, it sets forth that an institution must be able to provide documentation that clearly indicates that the institution will meet the three-season requirement, the minimum sports sponsorship requirement, and if adopted, the minimum financial aid requirement during the first year of provisional membership.

As my colleague, Joan McDermott, said earlier, it is important institutions be provided an educational period in order to learn rules related to recruiting, eligibility, financial aid and playing and practice seasons. However, the Management Council and the project team also believe that a commitment to sport sponsorship and a minimum level of financial aid should exist at the time of application. These institutions should be able to demonstrate a similar commitment to an intercollegiate sports program, as is demonstrated by current Division II members.

This proposal establishes such a requirement, and I urge your support.

[Proposal No. 11 was adopted, effective immediately.]

Provisional Membership—Application Fee

Bernard Franklin (Virginia Union University): On behalf of the Membership Review Project Team and the Division II Presidents Council, I would like to move Proposal 12.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal relates to the application fee paid by provisional members when they begin the provisional membership process in Division II. Currently, that fee is \$2,500. Those funds are used for various activities and expenses related to administration of the provisional membership program. However, this current fee is insufficient to cover the costs of such a program for four years.

The project team agreed that if the Membership Committee is expected to enhance the services we provide to provisional members, the program should be self sufficient, and the fee paid by an institu-

tion should cover the services it will receive for four years.

I urge your support of Proposal 12.

[Proposal No. 12 was adopted, effective immediately.]

Membership—Reclassification From Divisions I or III

James Watson (West Liberty State College): On behalf of the Membership Project Review Team, I would like to move Proposal 13.

[The motion was seconded.]

Unlike the proposals we've considered thus far, this proposal deals with reclassification to Division II from within the Association, as opposed to provisional membership.

This legislation simply states that if a Division III or a Division I institution desires to reclassify to Division II, the institution must be able to demonstrate compliance with Division II sports sponsorship requirements prior to the beginning of the reclassification process.

As you have heard from other members of the project team, we believe it is critical for any institution, regardless of its current membership affiliation, to demonstrate a commitment to Division II sports sponsorship requirements before it begins the process to join our division.

I continue to support this philosophy, and encourage you to adopt Proposal 13.

[Proposal 13 was adopted, effective immediately.]

Membership Requirements—Philosophy Statement

Charles Dunn (Henderson State University): On behalf of the Membership Review Project Team, I would like to move Proposal 14.

[The motion was seconded.]

While the current Division II philosophy statement helps distinguish Division II membership from Division III membership, it can be improved.

Proposal 14 is a clarification that distinguishes the different commitment to intercollegiate athletic programs that exists on most of our campuses. When Division III developed its philosophy of no athletic aid, a Division II philosophy was created to specify that such aid is permitted for student-athletes. The word "permitted" was selected to indicate a recognition that not every student-athlete in Division II would receive some sort of aid based on athletics ability. This philosophy statement recognized the division's commitment to athletics aid, but institutional autonomy in awarding such aid is protected.

The clarification set forth in Proposal 14 confirms the distinctions between Division II and III, yet permits considerable autonomy for institutions. For these reasons, I urge you to support Proposal 14.

Pamela Gill-Fisher (University of California, Davis): Last summer, as the Management Council reviewed the recommendations from the Membership Project Team to require financial aid minimums, it became apparent that we also needed to first review the philosophy statement and ensure that it was consistent with the pro-

posed financial aid requirement.

The Management Council responded with Proposal 14. The Management Council discussed whether it was possible to modify the philosophy statement this year and strengthen membership requirements via a minimum financial aid rule next year.

Upon advice of legal counsel, it was agreed that all Division II changes had to be made at this year's Convention before the moratorium is lifted.

Proposal 14 helps distinguish our membership division from others. I recommend that you vote in favor of Proposal 14.

Kay Schallenkamp (Emporia State University): I also rise to speak in favor of Proposal 14.

As a member of the Presidents Council, I'm aware of the research materials that the Division II Membership Review Project Team considered as it developed the legislative package that is before us today.

I'm convinced that the changes outlined in Proposal 14 are clarifications of the philosophy statement, not philosophical shifts that will alter the behavior of our member schools.

Currently, nearly every Division II institution is committed to a philosophy of awarding financial aid to student-athletes based on athletics ability. Division II recognizes contributions student-athletes make to our institutions and communities by permitting aid to be awarded based on such ability.

I support the clarification set forth in Proposal 14, and I encourage you to vote in favor of these changes.

[Proposal No. 14 was adopted, 235-7-1.]

Membership Requirements—Philosophy Statement

Jerry Hughes (Central Missouri State University): On behalf of the Membership Review Project Team and the Management Council, I would like to move Proposal 15.

[The motion was seconded.]

On Page 328 of the Division I Manual, it specifies that Division I member institutions believe in the self sufficiency of intercollegiate athletic departments. The Division I philosophy statement states Division I strives to finance its athletic programs insofar as possible from revenues generated by the program itself.

Proposal 15 helps distinguish Division II membership from Division I membership by recognizing that the emphasis for a Division II intercollegiate athletic program is to operate within the framework of institutionally approved budgets.

This is an important distinction that highlights the differences between the divisions. I urge your support.

Frank Brown (Columbus State University): I rise to support Proposal 15.

This proposal points out some of the pride we have in Division II about the philosophy under which we operate. It's very different, obviously, in Division II than you find in Division I, especially

Division I-A.

I support this proposal because it reminds us that funds supporting athletics must be managed by the institution and that Division II programs must strive to operate within institutionally approved budgets. I encourage my colleagues to approve Proposal 15.

Robert Hartwell (Adelphi University): I do find some things wrong with this proposal, simply taking it from a small, private institution's standpoint. Budgets are built around fund-raising goals for all schools within our university. All schools and departments do have in the budget certain ramifications of raising funds to help support the university.

I know a number of Division I schools that operate within the institutional budgets, but do raise funds that are part of the budget already. In other words, it's built into the budget.

We already have to put the money raised by institutions, into the institutions, so that the institution administers it. We don't administer it separately.

I basically don't understand why we're doing this, or why it has to be in our philosophy. I certainly think that our philosophy is to increase our budget so we can support our athletes better. There's nothing wrong with raising money to help our athletic programs.

Jerry Hughes (Central Missouri State University): What this philosophy statement includes would not preclude that. It just means that someone within the university must have sign-off authority, whether it's the director of athletics or the president or someone in the development office. It just means it's controlled that way.

[Proposal No. 15 was adopted, 230-14-0.]

Membership Requirements—Minimum Financial Aid Requirement

Kay Schallenkamp (Emporia State University): On behalf of the Membership Review Project Team and the Presidents Council, I move Proposal 16.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal will require all Division II institutions, both current and prospective members, to provide athletically related and other countable financial aid at a minimum level, as permitted in Division II financial aid legislation, and as referenced in the Division II philosophy statement.

A minimum financial aid requirement as a criteria for membership distinguishes Division II from Division III in setting forth a requirement that states Division II is not a nonscholarship division and also distinguishes Division II from Division I in establishing lesser thresholds for providing institutional financial aid.

The legislation ensures that all institutions in Division II provide countable aid while maintaining institutional autonomy in determining how such aid should be distributed among different sports programs.

The project team agreed that an active membership requirement should be modified or increased to ensure that all current members are operating with a similar philosophy as well as create requirements that reflect the identity of Division II. This idea is set forth as a priority in the strategic plan and significantly demonstrates a distinction from the other divisions.

While doing this, it was a goal of the group to create this requirement in a way that would not require current members to make wholesale changes to their program or significantly increase the amount of countable aid that the institution provides. The project team believes that this goal is accomplished with Proposal 16. I urge your support of this proposal.

Lea Rudee (University of California, San Diego): I wish to speak against this proposal.

We feel it's an infringement on individual institutional autonomy. Our faculty senate—and if you know anything about the University of California, the faculty senate has the ultimate responsibility in these matters—feels very adamantly that we should maintain our current policy of no financial aid based on athletic ability. We certainly give all of the need-based financial aid that any other institution does.

I point out that we have 23 sports. We're currently standing third in the Sears Cup. So our commitment to collegiate athletics cannot be doubted.

I realize that we're one of the seven, I'm told, schools that don't currently meet the current regulations. I am going to have our chancellor, who could not attend this meeting, start through the president's process to modify this proposal next year to say either you can do the financial aid requirements or sponsor a larger number of sports than the number 10 that will be coming up in the next proposal. So that will be in the mill during the next year through the normal procedures. Thank you.

Phillip Roach (Rollins College): I would like to speak on behalf of the Management Council to support Proposal 16.

In the past year, the Membership Review Project Team has done tremendous work in developing this proposed requirement. Each Division II conference was surveyed and asked to provide information regarding how many institutions would satisfy one of the three options included in the proposed minimum financial aid requirement. This information was gathered from the 2000-2001 financial aid information gathered by the financial aid squad list.

The results were what the project team expected when the thresholds you see in the proposed requirement were originally developed. The results of the survey included information on 239 active and provisional members. Of this number, only seven institutions did not satisfy the proposed minimum requirement.

This legislation is a positive step for Division II. Please keep in mind that the institutions have until August 1, 2005, to be in compli-

ance with this requirement, and a waiver provision is included.

We're doing a lot today to establish requirements that will help us manage the growth of Division II. This proposal is as important as any of the tools in creating managed growth in this area. Further, it ensures that all of us in this room today share a consistent philosophy, while maintaining autonomy, related to how our financial aid is distributed among sports and among student-athletes.

I hope you join the Management Council in unanimously supporting Proposal 16.

[Proposal No. 16 was adopted, 219-24-2, effective immediately.]

Membership Requirements—Minimum Sports Sponsorship

Bernard Franklin (Virginia Union University): On behalf of the Membership Review Project Team and the Presidents Council, I would like to move Proposal 17.

[The motion was seconded.]

Until 1984, the sports sponsorship requirement in Division II was six men's sports. At the 1984 Convention, legislation was adopted to recognize women's sports for sports sponsorship purposes, and the required minimum number of sports was six men's sports and six women's sports.

In 1985, the membership adopted Proposal 44 to reduce those minimum requirements to four sports for men and four sports for women. Therefore, our sports sponsorship minimum requirements have not been amended for 16 years.

In 1985, Division II membership totalled 185 institutions. Our membership is now 290 institutions. The time is right.

As with financial aid, our sports sponsorship requirements need to reflect our philosophy, and requirements need to distinguish us from other NCAA divisions. This is a proposal that will aid us in controlling growth by ensuring that prospective institutions share a consistent philosophy related to sports sponsorship.

This is also a proposal that will ensure that sports sponsorship requirements reflect what most institutions are currently doing and what we should all continue to strive to do in the sports sponsorship arena to further develop the Division II identity set forth in our strategic plan.

Twenty-one years ago, at the 1980 Convention in New Orleans, Division II delegates debated the merits of decreasing sports sponsorship requirements from six men's sports to four men's sports. The delegates defeated that proposal because they agreed that continuing to sponsor at least six quality sports demonstrated a commitment to a quality athletics program, which was important to the division's membership.

That philosophy is still alive today. It is time to increase our current requirements to further support that philosophy. I strongly urge your support of Proposal 17.

Charles Dunn (Henderson State University): On behalf of the

project team, I would like to speak in support of Proposal 17.

My colleague, President Franklin, indicated that we should have sports sponsorship requirements that reflect the number of sports that most institutions are currently sponsoring.

In 2000-2001, the average Division II sports sponsorship per institution was 6.45 sports for men and 6.13 sports for women. The number of institutions that sponsored four sports for men and four sports for women was 27. These are the institutions that would have to add additional sports by August 1, 2005, in order to meet the proposed requirements. Even in that regard, some of those 27 institutions may already have plans to add sports.

As you can see, our current requirements do not reflect what most Division II institutions currently sponsor. However, a minimum of eight sports is easily attainable for prospective members. An increase to 10 somewhat limits the pool of prospective institutions that could consider Division II membership. If for no other reason, we should adopt Proposal 17 based on that data.

This proposal was developed as a result of a spirit of compromise and negotiation. Some members of the governance structure wanted even more stringent membership requirements. An increase to 10 sports is a very legitimate compromise. I urge you to support Proposal 17.

[Proposal No. 17 was adopted, 226-17-1, effective immediately.]

Membership Requirements—Scheduling Requirements

David Riggins (Mars Hill College): On behalf of the Membership Review Project Team, I would like to move Proposal 18.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal 18 simply removes scheduling requirements as a condition and obligation of membership. As a member of the Championships Committee, I can assure you that each sports committee pays considerable attention to scheduling requirements, such as selection criteria, as a consideration for championships eligibility in all of our Division II championship sports. For instance, we already require 22 contests against Division II teams in order to qualify for Division II championship play in basketball.

For that reason, the Membership Review Project Team could find no compelling evidence that indicates that we should maintain a 50 percent scheduling requirement in football and men's and women's basketball as a requirement for Division II membership. This should be an issue of championships eligibility only.

I urge you to support Proposal 18.

[Proposal No. 18 was adopted, effective immediately.]

Playing and Practice Seasons—Individual Skill Instruction

Michael Kovalchik (Hillsdale College): On behalf of the Legislation Committee, I would like to move Proposal 19.

[The motion was seconded.]

In keeping with our deregulation goals, this proposal eliminates the need for unnecessary bookkeeping paperwork, yet preserves the mandate that skill-related instruction remain voluntary. We know that most institutions do not have a regular documentation process by which student-athletes request this type of instruction. Therefore, this proposal deregulates legislation that currently requires needless documentation, while preserving the voluntary nature of the activity for student-athletes.

I urge your support of Proposal 19.

Peggy Green (Fayetteville State University): On behalf of the Management Council, I would like to speak in support of Proposal 19.

Current legislation requires the student-athlete to request individual skill instruction, thus creating unnecessary documentation and tracking by compliance administrators.

The proposal represents a more practical approach for student-athletes and institutions alike. Coaches can schedule times for skill-related instruction. Although student-athletes would no longer have to request such instruction, it would nevertheless remain a voluntary activity for them.

This proposal furthers our deregulation efforts, while maintaining the principle of minimizing interference with student-athletes' academic progress by keeping the instruction voluntary.

I urge your support of Proposal 19.

[Proposal No. 19 was adopted, 233-8-0.]

Playing and Practice Seasons— Countable Athletically Related Activities

Suzanne Sanregret (Michigan Technological University): On behalf of the Legislation Committee, I would like to move Proposal 20.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal 20 is intended to create a simpler way to count time spent on countable athletically related activities. The way the legislation presently reads, it is extremely difficult for an institution to determine if a certain activity should be counted toward the maximum number of hours a student-athlete can spend on athletic-related activities.

The new legislation would eliminate the laundry list and allow the institution to determine if the activity is countable simply by applying the new definition. This proposal, if adopted, would create a more consistent method of application by simplifying the manner in which activities are analyzed. The simplicity is in the spirit of deregulation, and I strongly urge you to support this proposal.

Phillip Roach (Rollins College): On behalf of the Management Council, I would like to speak in support of Proposal 20.

Discussion held at the 2000 Deregulation Summit revealed that institutions regularly count athletically related activities differently. The difference in how the hours are counted results in a disparity

regarding the application of this rule.

This proposal creates a clear and concise definition of a countable related activity, thereby making the rule easier to administer. The simplicity in administration protects the consistency of the application for the Division II membership. The more consistent the application, the more equitable the playing field.

I strongly urge you to support the proposal.

[Proposal No. 20 was adopted, 235-6-0.]

Playing and Practice Seasons—Weekly Time Limitations

Clint Bryant (Augusta State University): On behalf of the Legislation Committee, I would like to move Proposal 21.

[The motion was seconded.]

In accordance with the principle behind all playing and practice season legislation, this proposal sets forth a reasonable weekly time limit on athletic-related activities for multisport student-athletes. The student-athletes are in support of the 20-hour per week limit, and it reflects what coaches reasonably expect from their student-athletes. Moreover, this proposal further solves deregulation efforts by eliminating current legislation that is not in the best interests of our student-athletes.

I urge your support of Proposal No. 21.

Sharon Gorgani (Elizabeth City State University): I represent the Division II Student-Athlete Advisory Committee.

The Division II Student-Athlete Advisory Committee supports Proposal No. 21, Playing and Practice Seasons—Weekly Time Limitations. The Division II Student-Athlete Advisory Committee has always supported the 20-hour weekly time limitations for athletic participation.

This proposal is consistent with Division II's desire to provide student-athletes with sound education principles and practices at member institutions. Even with multisport athletes, focus on academics is always a priority. We feel that this limitation is in the best interests of the student-athlete.

The Student-Athlete Advisory Committee supports the 20-hour-per-week maximum and encourages you to support this legislation.

[Proposal No. 21 was adopted, 237-3-1.]

Playing and Practice Seasons—Competition Day Time Limitations

Kim Vinson (Cameron University): On the behalf of the Legislation Committee, I would like to move Proposal 22.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal 22 is intended to clarify how many hours must be counted toward the limits for athletically related activity when scrimmages are conducted. The present legislation permits institutions to conduct scrimmages and requires that they only count them as three hours of activity, regardless of the actual duration.

This legislation would require that institutions count the scrim-

mage hours as the actual duration of the competition. This change certainly is consistent with the purpose of deregulation in ensuring that the regulation accurately reflects the Division II philosophy.

I strongly urge you to support this proposal.

Shawn Kelley (University of Nebraska, Omaha): I represent the Division II Student-Athlete Advisory Committee.

The Division II Student-Athlete Advisory Committee strongly supports Proposal No. 22, Playing and Practice Season—Competition Day Time Limits. The Student-Athlete Advisory Committee constantly and consistently supports the 20-hour weekly time limitations regarding athletic participation. This proposal protects student-athlete welfare by ensuring that the 20-hour limit is truly met. Scrimmages are practices, not competition. Therefore, they should be counted as the actual time participated.

The legislation would eliminate the potential abuse of the original intent in order to create a more appropriate parameter regarding the time that student-athletes spend away from their studies.

The Student-Athlete Advisory Committee encourages you to support Proposal No. 22.

Valerie Sheley (Presbyterian College): On behalf of the Management Council, I would like to speak in support of Proposal 22.

This proposed legislative change would positively affect the welfare of student-athletes. The original legislation setting forth weekly time limits was adopted to restrict the number of hours athletics requires in the life of a student-athlete.

By requiring institutions to count the scrimmage as the actual duration of the activity, it will ensure that the hours are counted more accurately and will reflect the actual amount of time the student-athlete is spending on the activity. As a result, student-athletes' welfare is better protected and maintained.

I strongly urge your support of this proposal.

Barbara Schroeder (Regis University, Colorado): While I feel that I am in favor of this legislation, I know yesterday I posed the question, and got one interpretation. I understand there's been some conversation, and that the interpretation could be amended a bit.

Again, my scenario was with spring volleyball. Our teams do quite a bit of going to a site, playing a tournament, several matches in a day. What is the actual countable time for those types of activities?

Jim Johnson (NCAA Staff): Barb, thank you for allowing me to redeem myself from the Issues Forum yesterday.

I think what we talked about yesterday, technically, is still true. As you notice, Proposal 22 is drafted so that it affects exempted scrimmages that will be created by Proposal 25, or that already exist in some sports. This limit applies to those exempted scrimmages. It doesn't affect any countable contests, like volleyball in the spring season, the four dates. You would still operate those just like you have in the past. This only applies to exempted scrimmages.

Ms. Schroeder: Thank you.

[Proposal No. 22 was adopted, 236-4-1.]

**Playing and Practice Seasons—
Preseason Off-Campus Intrasquad Scrimmage**

Sue Willey (University of Indianapolis): On behalf of the Legislation Committee, I would like to move Proposal 23.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal 23 is intended to eliminate legislation that historically has roots in Division I. Current legislation reflects a concern for pre-season barnstorming tours in basketball and football. This is not a Division II concern. Realistically, off-campus intrasquad practices may actually benefit Division II institutions by affording increased public relation opportunities, additional fund-raising venues and greater pre-season public interest in a particular support.

I urge your support of Proposal 23.

Robert Hartwell (Adelphi University): I have a question.

I could see this as an opportunity to recruit. In other words, could my basketball teams go to a high school for an intrasquad scrimmage while we're recruiting two or three of their athletes, and take advantage of being at the school? That's why I have a concern about this.

The second thing is regarding the fund-raising issue. Are we going to be raising funds, or not?

Jim Johnson: I'll respond to the first of that. The second is a more of an intent-based question. But the first part is, you will have to be careful when you're at a high school, depending on what recruiting period you're in. The recruiting period would still apply. This would just take out this conclusion that we'll allow you to never do it.

Mr. Hartwell: Thank you for that answer. I still think that different institutions can use it as a recruiting tool. If that's all right, I'd be happy to do it.

[Proposal No. 23 was adopted, 228-15-2.]

Playing and Practice Seasons—Missed Class Time

Mary Gardner (Bloomsburg University of Pennsylvania): On behalf of the Legislation Committee, I would like to move Proposal 24.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal will keep our student-athletes in class during the nonchampionship season. This proposal puts academics first by requiring that out-of-season competition be held when student-athletes are not required to be in class. The Legislation Committee believes that, unlike individual sports where facilities may not be available when classes are not in session, team sports do have access to practice facilities on days and times student-athletes are not in class.

This is good legislation that is in the best interests of our student-athletes, and I urge your support of Proposal 24.

Clyde Doughty Jr. (New York Institute of Technology): On behalf of the Management Council, I would like to speak in support of Proposal 24.

First and foremost, I would ask the membership to consider the amount of class time our student-athletes already are required to miss during the traditional or championship segment of their season. If Proposal 24 is adopted, we would prevent this issue from being a year-round concern and instead keep our student-athletes in class where they belong.

Proposal 24 seeks to minimize interference with academics, and therefore I urge your support.

John Keating (University of Wisconsin, Parkside): On behalf of the Presidents Council, I would like to speak in support of Proposal 24.

As you are aware, the principle governing playing and practice season legislation requires that the time demanded of our student-athletes to participate in athletics be regulated to minimize interference with academics. Proposal 24 seeks to accomplish this purpose.

It is in the best interests of our student-athletes' academic future that they not be required to miss class as a result of competition outside of their championship season. I therefore urge your support of Proposal 24.

Tom Brown (C.W. Post Campus/Long Island University): I represent the Division II Student-Athlete Advisory Committee.

Division II SAAC strongly opposes Proposal No. 24. The Division II Student-Athlete Advisory Committee understands the importance of ideas and concepts that address excessive amount of missed class time by fellow student-athletes. However, this specific piece of legislation will hinder student-athletes' opportunity rather than promote student-athlete welfare.

Adoption of this legislation will greatly limit competitive opportunities that student-athletes are afforded in the nonchampionship season. Team sports conducting nonchampionship competition already have legislation that strictly limits the number of competitive contacts allowed during this time period.

The nonchampionship season allows student-athletes an invaluable opportunity to travel in order to compete against a broad caliber of institutions that they normally wouldn't compete against during the championship season. Furthermore, this type of competition is essential in allowing teams to evaluate their progress against a backdrop of competition they may face in a championship setting.

It is important to remember that the championship and non-championship segments occur in separate semesters. As such, the number of absences incurred in each semester is not cumulative over that academic year.

Considering the wide spectrum of attendance policies and academic requirements instituted throughout the membership, the Division II Student-Athlete Advisory Committee believes that regu-

lation of this issue would be better addressed at an institutional level rather than mandated through legislation imposed by the division.

Again, the Division II Student-Athlete Advisory Committee implores you to hear the student-athletes' voice and oppose Proposal No. 24.

Earl Robinson (Lees-McRae College): We're currently in a season of deregulation and institutional autonomy. Proposal No. 24 flies in the face of these initiatives. Therefore, legislation is not needed.

Institutions have the strictures and structures to limit off-season missed classes. They can do this in and of themselves. Therefore, there is no need for the Association to supersede our institutional autonomy and our own ability to govern ourselves. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 24 was adopted, 162-83-2.]

Playing and Practice Seasons—Annual Exemptions

Sharon Taylor (Lock Haven University of Pennsylvania): On behalf of the Legislation Committee, I move Proposal No. 25.

[The motion was seconded.]

After considerable review of Bylaw 17, the committee recognized the repetitive nature of the list of annual exemptions in each sport. The committee also noted the difficulty in administering these exemptions due to inconsistency of rules among sports.

This proposal, if adopted, will simply provide a master list for all sports to follow and will provide all sports the same number of discretionary exemptions. The master list will be placed at the beginning of Bylaw 17 and will eliminate the need for separate lists under each sport.

This deregulation effort not only simplifies application and understanding of the bylaw, but it also allows for several pages of the Manual to be eliminated, an observation designed to ensure unanimous vote.

Dede Allen (University of Alaska Anchorage): On behalf of the Management Council, I would like to speak in support of this proposal.

The Management Council recommends the adoption of the proposed legislation. There have been several problems regarding the understanding of exempted contests legislation. This legislation will greatly diminish the number of issues that will arise in this area. If passed, this change will provide for a more consistent application of the exemptions available to each sport and the number of exemptions allowed. The consistency will lend itself to more of a comprehensible and easily understandable approach to exemptions and therefore will decrease the number of issues that have previously plagued the application of this rule.

I strongly urge your support of this proposal.

[Proposal No. 25 was adopted, 239-1-1.]

PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS—PERMISSIBLE DATES AND OUT-OF-SEASON ACTIVITIES

Ms. Cormier: Proposal No. 26 applies to all fall and spring sports except outdoor track and field. It is drafted in a nontraditional format in an attempt to reduce confusion that might exist if drafts for every sport were included in the Official Notice. This is typical when drafting proposals to amend playing- and practice-season legislation in NCAA Bylaw 17. Read the note that follows in Parts A and C of the proposal.

Also, I would like you to note the Convention Program correction distributed in this morning's procedural issues sheet regarding the first permissible date of competition is February 1, not February 15, as published.

I would also like you to note something about amendment-to-amendment No. 26-1 that was distributed this morning. Proposal No. 26 must be moved and seconded before Proposal No. 26-1 can be considered.

Michael Kovalchik (Hillsdale College): On behalf of the Legislation Committee, I would like to move Proposal No. 26.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal 26 is arguably the most significant change in legislation we have considered since the inception of the deregulation project. It is significant because it makes changes to Bylaw 17 for all fall and spring sports, except outdoor track, that will undoubtedly make the playing and practice season significantly easier to administer and make the legislative requirements related to start dates, end dates and nonchampionship segment activities much simpler to understand and interpret.

Winter sports are not affected. The model used to develop this concept was the model used for most winter sports.

The emerging sports and National Collegiate Championship sports are not affected. We felt it was necessary to retain current legislation in those sports since Division II student-athletes compete against Division I and Division III student-athletes in those championships.

The Legislation Committee spent considerable time developing this concept and took great care to make sure it is feasible for all sports included.

This is a good deregulation proposal, and I strongly urge your support. Thank you.

Pamela Gill-Fisher (University of California, Davis): On behalf of the Management Council, I would like to move Proposal 26-1.

The Management Council agreed to sponsor this amendment-to-amendment based on a recommendation from our 16 institutions in Division II that sponsor rowing and from our Division II Rowing Committee. Those constituents convinced both Councils that there are issues very much unique to rowing. The most significant of those

issues is the fact that the majority of our rowing athletes are walk-ons who have no prior experience in the sport and no basic skill level. It is fair to say for that reason, coaches probably need more than 24 days during the nonchampionship season to teach the sport to those 40 to 60 walk-ons.

We don't believe that by creating this exception we are opening the door for any and all sports to make the same case. No other Division II championship sport can make the case related to 40 to 60 walk-ons coming to practice with no skill level.

We can't expect these rowing athletes to practice without supervision or direction from coaches for obvious safety and liability concerns. Again, this is a case that I don't believe other sports can make.

Lastly, when Proposal 26 was initially developed in November of 2000, rowing was an emerging sport, and this legislation did not apply. It only applied once a Division II rowing championship was established this past spring.

I urge you to support this amendment-to-amendment.

Ms. Cormier: We're going to do a paddle vote on 26-1. Again, so that you all know what you're doing, this vote is for playing and practice seasons permissible dates and out-of-season activities, exception rowing. This is a paddle vote first.

[Amendment No. 26-1 was adopted.]

Now we will consider 26 as amended.

Bernard Franklin (Virginia Union University): On behalf of the Presidents Council, I would like to speak in support of Proposal 26.

I would first like to congratulate the Legislation Committee on its work in developing this proposal. The Presidents Council joins the Management Council in unanimous support of it, and I hope that you will do the same.

There will be interpretive issues that will come up and legislative issues that need to be addressed, as this is a global change that makes significant modification to Bylaw 17. The Legislation Committee has assured the Presidents Council they will monitor those issues and take appropriate action to address them, and I trust they will do that.

For the past three years, we have focused on what's good for the division as a whole in considering deregulation proposals. We adopted legislation in the areas of recruiting and financial aid that were positive changes for a majority of the membership and have not defeated proposals because of a perceived disadvantage for a small number of schools.

This proposal simplifies legislation, while also addressing an issue that has long concerned many Division II CEOs—the significant amount of practice and competition occurring in the nonchampionship segment. Something we do not allow in football and basketball currently.

This is good legislation that everyone can live with, and I strongly urge your support.

Cameron MacDonald (Rockhurst University): I represent the Division II Student-Athlete Advisory Committee.

The Division II SAAC supports Proposal 26. The student-athletes agree that this proposal complies with the spirit of deregulation. It will make the current legislation easier to interpret and apply in a variety of sports.

Universal compliance with Proposal No. 26 will also promote equality, as all schools will begin practice at the same time. This proposal addresses increasing concerns regarding the amount of time student-athletes are spending out of season and may avoid possible future proposals to completely eliminate nonchampionship practice and competition. Importantly, this proposal preserves student-athletes' opportunity to pursue individual skill instruction on days when no scheduled team practices occur.

Again, the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee urges the delegates to support Proposal No. 26.

Steven Rackley (University of Findlay): Understanding the importance of simplifying legislation and deregulation, and respecting the amount of work that's gone into this proposal, I urge rejection of this proposal for the following reasons.

In our search for deregulation and trying to create a level playing field, we are doing the opposite. An example is the sport of golf. By setting such restrictions, northern schools will be at a significant disadvantage in the fall and spring, thus having the opposite effect of what was intended and creating a very uneven playing field for our student-athletes.

Also, understanding the uniqueness of sports, sometimes a blanket policy is not the best policy.

Once again, I urge rejection of this proposal. Thank you.

Ed Harris (West Texas A&M University): On behalf of the Management Council, I would like to speak in favor of Proposal 26.

As an athletic director, I encourage your support of the proposal. I look forward to no longer having to count practice opportunities for football, volleyball, soccer and other fall sports, and worry about whether we have counted days correctly or were starting on the wrong date. I also look forward to not having to count 132 days or 144 days on a calendar and worry about whether we have exceeded the number of days. Finally, I look forward to being able to recoup some lost days for the baseball team in the fall due to bad weather.

It makes sense to me that we operate all sports like we operate basketball: Specific starting date, ending date and parameters for off-season. Likewise, using the football model for off-season or the non-championship segment period is sensible to me.

Although the number of days may be less than some would like, it's a feasible compromise between where we are now and no off-season practice at all, which has been suggested by some.

This is good legislation. I also believe that it can be tweaked as we go along. I urge your support.

Joel Smith (Rocky Mountain Athletic Conference): On behalf of our conference, I want to urge you to reject this proposal.

Although it has good intent and we support the intent of simplification, we have some concerns about our fellow brethren in cold-weather states who now will be more restricted, not only by the restrictions for the nontraditional season, but by the weather issues that might be accompanying that.

I just want to make sure we get that point across. We urge you to defeat this proposal.

[Proposal No. 26 was adopted, as amended.]

Playing and Practice Seasons—Football Spring Practice

Ms. Cormier: Proposal No. 27 is a roll-call vote. This is a football-only vote. Only those schools sponsoring football as a varsity sport are permitted to participate in the roll-call vote for this proposal.

Please note your Convention Program correction distributed in this morning's procedural issues sheet that this is a football-only vote.

Suzanne Sanregret (Michigan Technological University): On behalf of the Legislation Committee, I would like to move Proposal 27.

[The motion was seconded.]

The Legislation Committee believes that we do not need national legislation prohibiting practice on certain days. Institutions should have the ability to determine when the teams practice. If institutions deem necessary, they can make a policy prohibiting countable athletically related activities on Sunday or any other day.

I urge your support of Proposal 27.

Lisa Colvin (Southern Arkansas University): On behalf of the Management Council, I would like to speak in support of Proposal 27.

Institutions may find Sunday practice necessary to avoid conflict with class and to reschedule practice days canceled due to weather. Proposal 27 will prevent schools from having to go through ARS to get an extension of the 29-day window for those common occurrences.

Proposal 27 does not prevent an institution from prohibiting Sunday practice. It just removes the decision from a national level and puts it on an institutional level where it belongs.

I urge your support of Proposal 27. Thank you.

Nathan Salant (Gulf Southern Conference): I have a procedural question.

If I heard correctly, you stated that only those institutions that sponsor the sport of football are to vote. Are conferences that sponsor this sport with an official championship in their conference also permitted to vote?

Ms. Cormier: They are. Thank you for that clarification. I appreciate that.

[Proposal No. 27 was adopted, 128-7-0.]

Eligibility—Satisfactory-Progress—Correspondence, Extension and Distance-Learning Courses

Kevin Hickey (Assumption College): On behalf of the Management Council, I would like to move Proposal 28.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal 28 is an attempt to address the current trends and technology. This proposed legislation will allow the use of correspondence, extension and distance-learning courses to meet satisfactory-progress requirements, with specific conditions. This allows student-athletes to advance with the changes in learning style. Allowing them to do so will provide them with a learning experience consistent with those that all other students currently have and allow them to count such courses for degree credit.

Please remember that all such courses must be acceptable as transferrable credit at the student-athlete's certifying institution.

I strongly urge the membership to support this proposal.

Michael Thompson (Delta State University): I'd like to express my opposition to this proposal.

Even though we embrace technology, I sit in decision meetings and I hear presidents talk again and again about how we don't want students to miss class. Now we're going to vote on a proposal where a student doesn't have to go to class.

I think education happens when a student is sitting in a classroom and interacting with a faculty member and learning things. I think if we pass this legislation, we're only going to lead to abuse of the satisfactory-progress rules. This goes directly to the issues of fair play and equality for Division II schools.

I urge that we defeat this proposal. Thank you.

Mary Lisko (Augusta State University): As chair of the Division II Academic Requirements Committee, I urge your support of this motion.

Advancements in technology and the rapid growth of the Internet have changed the way that education is delivered to students. In many cases, a distance-learning articulation agreement may allow students to pursue a degree in a specialized major.

Our Academic Requirements Committee believes that course work, including distance-learning, correspondence and credit-by-exam courses, in which an institution accepts transferrable-degree credit, should also count toward fulfillment of satisfactory progress.

This proposal assumes institutional control and assumes also the integrity for the transfer courses accepted toward degree programs. I would like to remind the body here that the proposal in no way negates the need for full-time enrollment at the certifying institution for practice and competition.

On behalf of the Academic Requirements Committee, I urge you to vote "yes" for Proposal No. 28.

W. Clinton Pettus (Cheyney University of Pennsylvania): On

behalf of the Presidents Council, I would like to speak in support of Proposal 28.

This proposal will provide for more diverse types of learning environments for student-athletes. This will allow student-athletes to participate in the multiple variations of learning styles available to the general student population in regard to higher education. To deny the student-athlete the availability of such opportunities is denying them freedom of choice in learning styles and in alternative routes to success. The denial of such a freedom would stifle the overall learning experience of the student-athlete and run contrary to the principles of higher education.

I strongly urge you to support this proposal.

David Riggins (Mars Hill College): We need to keep in mind that if we deny this proposal, we're not denying access to these courses. They are certainly available for graduation. We're discussing continuing eligibility.

Proposal 28 allows use of correspondence, extension and distance-learning courses to meet satisfactory-progress requirements under specified conditions. Those specifics are simply missing from the legislation.

I think we have to question whether we can maintain the integrity of continuing eligibility when we don't have stated safeguards for that purpose. Let's keep in mind that when we pass this legislation, we're saying that a student-athlete can use distance-learning and we're also continuing legislation that says that a student-athlete who goes to class on our campus in a summer school course cannot use that course for continuing eligibility if it does not meet the 75/25. So we're denying use of courses on our own campuses, while we're applying distance-learning opportunities.

I think the legislation could also have unintended impact regarding the general well being of our institutions in this way: If your institution is enrollment driven, or you have a funding formula that requires your student-athlete to be registered in class on your campus, then I'm not sure what the impact is. I'm going to need someone in my institution tell me what is the impact to our campus if I have a student-athlete who takes a semester, stays at home, sits behind his computer—and at the risk of sounding questioning, I hope it's my student-athlete who is sitting at that computer and not someone else—but if they are at home, continuing their eligibility, how does that impact funding at my institution?

I'm not saying that this is not something that we need to consider. I'm just worried about the fact that I'm not sure we have the specifics, and we haven't had enough discussion regarding the implications.

Jon Carey (Western Oregon University): My concern with this legislation is not in the distance-learning component. All the points made positively and negatively are certainly good. My concern is now the allowed use of credit-by-examination courses taken at other uni-

versities. In the distance-learning courses and extension courses, it's much easier to determine the validity of those courses. In a credit-by-exam taken somewhere else, I don't know that the same control exists.

Nathan Salant (Gulf South Conference): This also has some interesting recruiting implications that you might want to consider.

Just listening to discussion in this immediate area, I'm hearing many schools say: "We don't allow correspondence courses" or "We do not allow credit-by-exam." If the NCAA permits this, it conceivably gives a tremendous recruiting advantage to some other institutions.

For example, a student-athlete could easily be told: "You can go home during the summer, stay home, live in your community, do what you want, and take two or three summer school courses in that manner, as long as you fit within that 75/25 guideline."

There are a number of other similar kinds of problems that you might want to consider. Certainly the concept of distance-learning through the Internet has merit. It just might not be polished, and the legislation may not be currently at the exact wording that we would like to see it at. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 28 was adopted, 154-82-6.]

Two-Year College Transfers—Eligibility For Practice— Partial Qualifiers

Ross Brummett (Carson-Newman College): On behalf of the Legislation Committee, I would like to move Proposal 29.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal would permit two-year college transfer of student-athletes who are certified as partial qualifiers by the NCAA Initial Eligibility Clearinghouse to practice during their first academic year in residence at the certifying institution when the transfer requirements for competition have not been satisfied.

The Legislation Committee believes that when 1996 Convention Proposal 22 was adopted to allow incoming freshman who were partial qualifiers to practice, it was likely an oversight not to apply that same standard to two-year college transfers who were partial qualifiers but who did not satisfy the requirements for competition at the time of transfer.

I urge you to support Proposal 29.

Jerry Hughes (Central Missouri State University): As a member of the Division II Management Council, I urge you to adopt Proposal 29.

Currently, incoming freshmen who are partial qualifiers are permitted to practice during the initial year of enrollment. This legislation will make available the same opportunity to two-year college transfers, as is available to incoming freshman, and gives us an opportunity to treat all partial qualifiers with consistent application of the legislation.

The Management Council urges your support of this proposal.

Sue Willey (University of Indianapolis): I urge the delegates to support this proposal for the reasons that have already been cited. However, I do want to emphasize one important point. With the adoption of this proposal, there is an advantage for student-athletes participating in countable athletically related activities such as practice and conditioning activities.

The ability to participate in practice activities with the team will contribute to the monitoring of the transfer student-athlete's success academically and satisfying the satisfactory-progress requirements during their initial year of residence.

The Legislation Committee believes that there is no harm in allowing these student-athletes to participate in practice activities. I urge you to adopt Proposal 29.

[Proposal No. 29 was adopted.]

Ms. Cormier: This is a very, very good working group. We have now completed all of our presidential grouping. All of the remaining proposals are going to be paddle votes.

I think we can take a break here for about 10 minutes.

Mike Racy (NCAA Staff): We do have to break for the opportunity for a window of reconsideration. It allows delegates to caucus and look for anyone who voted on the prevailing side, if someone wants to come back and consider any of the proposals—

From the Floor: You have all afternoon to do that.

Ms. Cormier: Our NCAA Convention rules say that you must have a window of reconsideration. You do not have to call this a break, okay? This is not a break. This is an opportunity for you to talk with each other for a couple of minutes. Then we will have a window of reconsideration and come back and finish. We'll do our best to get you out of here by noon.

[Note: The delegates recessed for 10 minutes.]

WINDOW OF RECONSIDERATION

Ms. Cormier: We call this Convention back to order, please. This Convention is back in session. Please take your seats.

This is our opportunity for our window of reconsideration. Are there any proposals that came before the Convention this morning that need to be reconsidered? Please come to the appropriate microphone, state your name and affiliation.

Playing and Practice Seasons — Missed Class Time

Barbara Schroeder (Regis University, Colorado): My institution voted on the prevailing side of Proposal 24. I would like to move for reconsideration of that proposal.

[The motion was seconded.]

Ms. Cormier: We will now invite anyone to speak on the motion.

Thomas Brown (C.W. Post Campus/Long Island University): I represent the Division II Student-Athlete Advisory Committee.

I want to again emphasize our opposition to this proposal. Adoption of this legislation will greatly limit competitive opportunities among schools that compete in the nonchampionship season. It is very important to remember that the championship and nonchampionship segments occur in separate semesters. As such, the number of absences and credits in each semester will be independent and will not accumulate over the academic year.

Also, considering the wide spectrum of attendance policies and academic requirements instituted throughout the membership, the Division II SAAC believes that regulation of this issue would be better addressed at an institutional level, rather than mandated through legislation imposed by the division.

Again, please listen to the student-athletes' voice on this proposal. I urge you to oppose.

Joel Smith (Rocky Mountain Athletic Conference): I am speaking against Proposal 24.

I represent a conference in which we have travel distances of over 600 miles in some cases to small communities. This will severely restrict the opportunity for us to compete in the nontraditional segment, which, if that's the intent of this proposal, then we have an imbalance in comparison to other areas where the opportunity to compete is much closer.

I urge you to defeat this proposal.

Jean Cerra (Barry University): I'm the vice-provost and an academic officer at my institution, and I'm definitely in favor of restricting the amount of time that a student misses from class for competition.

We have very stringent policies at Barry. However, our policies are applied equitably to all of our student-athletes. I'm speaking in favor of reconsideration, and against Proposal No. 24 because it creates a serious disparate treatment of our student-athletes, particularly institutions that are in northern climates. We're in a southern climate. But northern climates, if you have baseball and softball in the fall where your competition at that time is critical to you, those students will be unable to miss class, but your golfers and even tennis players can. That creates serious difficulties within your student-athlete ranks and something that I don't think institutions want to lean towards.

The other problem, as was pointed out, is that institutions that have to travel long distances now are forced to have to compress their travel and their competition into a shorter period of time, which could create some safety or serious cost implications because they are going to be forced to fly, rather than use other means of transportation.

I urge reconsideration of Proposal No. 24 and the ultimate defeat of Proposal No. 24.

Heather Andrews (Missouri Southern State College): Once again, I would like to reiterate the stance of the Division II Student-Athlete Advisory Committee in opposition to this proposal.

We would like to reinforce the point about geographical location. We think this would be very unfair to some schools, and it would hinder their travels.

Also, we are a little bit concerned about the fact that nobody showed us hard data indicating that student-athletes are performing more poorly due to missed class time. We think that we're unique in Division II in that we have smaller class sizes and because student-athletes can work with their coaches. That's something that makes us special in Division II.

Also, we're talking about a specific number of days. It was brought to my attention that in soccer you can have five competitions in the nonchampionship segment in a period of 24 days, which would only consider a time frame of four weekends. So we're a little bit confused as to how you would put in five competitions, perhaps in four weekends, without missing any class.

Also, we are talking about two different semesters. In Division II, perhaps the classes you need to take are not offered every semester. As a science major, I know some of my classes were offered once every two years. So in essence, I could have a much fuller course load in the championship segment, and this particular proposal is going to do me no good by missing class in the nonchampionship segment.

Our last point. We really feel this could put some undue pressure on student-athletes as far as making their course schedules and perhaps even taking their majors, depending on when these classes would come.

Once again, we would just welcome your opposition to this proposal.

Peter Chapman (Missouri Western State College): I promised a lot of colleagues I wouldn't come to the microphone today. I lied.

I have a great concern. I'm in support of the legislation. I have some concern in that as an athletic director I am constantly fighting faculty and people in the spring semester and defending the number of missed classes that our kids are missing in the sports of baseball, softball, golf, in terms of their academics and the number of classes they are missing because of the structure of the sports. Institutionally, we did develop a policy that prohibits missed classes during what used to be the nontraditional segments to work with our faculty in terms of those things.

We are talking about the nonchampionship segment of our schedules. We're not talking about the championships. We defend academic performance and all this, but we're talking about a nonchampionship series. We're talking about a time during which nothing happens in that time to determine whether you get to the championships. I know it does indirectly. But we are talking about academics, and we are talking about going to class.

I know our student-athletes are special. I know that they do an awful lot of things in terms of their time management and all these other things. But we're just adding to their requirements to have to

do that by allowing them to miss classes again in the fall or the spring, wherever it falls into it.

I have empathy for the people who have distance, in terms of this nonchampionship time. I have empathy for you. But the student-athlete, in terms of the number one priority when we get through with this, is going to class and graduating and doing all this stuff.

Mary White (Lees-McRae College): As a faculty member, if I have an evening class and a student would need to miss that class in the nonchampionship segment to travel with the team, I am now not permitted to say: "I will work with you. We'll see that it gets made up." My academic freedom as a professor is limited by this.

If my school is having a problem with students missing classes because of participation in the nonchampionship segment, there is nothing currently that would preclude my school from institutionally banning missed classes during the nonchampionship segment. But as a group, we are opposed to having that dictated to us.

This is taking away institutional control and is going against the spirit of deregulation.

Paul Engelmann (Central Missouri State University): I'm the chair of the Legislation Committee. On behalf of the Legislation Committee, I would urge you to defeat this proposal to reconsider and consider the legislation that was earlier adopted.

If you ask me as a student whether I'd rather play my sport or go to class, it's a no-brainer for me. I'd much rather play my sport. If you ask me as a faculty member would I rather be out playing golf some days than teaching class, I would rather be out playing golf. But there are some things I have an obligation to do.

If we really believe that these individuals are student-athletes, as opposed to athlete-students, it seems to me their first obligation in the nonchampionship segment is to be in class when class is scheduled.

I'm sorry. You don't get the same level of attention, you don't get the same presentation, when you come to catch up on work you've missed as you did if you attended the class I taught.

To my colleagues who are faculty, I would urge you to stand up for academic integrity. Make the decision that these are student-athletes we're dealing with. Recognize the fact that in the nonchampionship segment, many of them have to take greater academic loads because of the class time they miss during the championship segment and defeat this proposal to reconsider. Thank you.

Roy Pruett (Bluefield State College): I think we're possibly overlooking the fact that students are in school to get an education.

We strongly support the playing of sports. We have no problem with that. A couple of things we need to consider, as the faculty advisor for students, I try to advise students to maybe take fewer classes in their playing season and increase their load in the nonplaying season.

I think faculty recognize the fact that most schools have more

administrators, more adjunct faculty and fewer full-time faculty, which, in turn is putting additional load on the full-time faculty. When we have the extra burden of making up tests, it would add burden to faculty, so the students receive less attention.

Thank you so very much.

Kelly Higgins (University of South Dakota): A previous colleague made mention earlier of the northern climates, and I wanted a clarification on Bylaw No. 26 concerning the exemption on golf and the consideration of whether that's the fall season or the spring season, the championship or nonchampionship season.

Based upon this, I would guess that your nonchampionship season, whichever the institution selected, would then not be allowed to participate on a day where you would miss classes. Therefore, there's a potential that those schools that are in northern climates would have difficulty actually having a competition to be able to compete for NCAA events.

Jim Johnson (NCAA Staff): Kelly, remember, Proposal 24 only applies to team sports.

James Fallis (University of Northern Colorado): I would call the question on the motion to reconsider.

Ms. Cormier: The question has been called. There is no debate. This is a roll-call vote to reconsider Proposal No. 24. That's what you're voting on first.

[The motion to reconsider Proposal No. 24 failed.]

Are there any other proposals that you would like to have reconsidered?

We're now going to move to Proposal No. 30. This is a paddle vote. I should say that the Presidents Council has agreed to oppose this membership-sponsored proposal.

I've been told that I have to officially close that window of reconsideration. I apologize to the delegates.

We'll now go to Proposal No. 30. As I've said, this is a paddle vote.

Amateurism—Photograph Sales

Nathan Salant (Gulf South Conference): On behalf of the 18 institutions that have sponsored this legislation, I move Proposal No. 30.

[The motion was seconded.]

This past May, we made a mistake in that we contracted with a photographer to allow that photographer to take pictures at our conference baseball championship. Our initial read of the NCAA legislation permitted this, but subsequently we discovered that was not permissible.

We exercised complete control over the photographer, his activity, and the dollars and cents involved. But still, that was not permitted. We limited the amount of time he was allowed to sell these photos on his Web site. But again, when we found out this was not permitted, we immediately stopped the activity.

What we subsequently learned was that there were quite a few institutions, and possibly some other conferences, that were making the same mistake. We began reviewing what would the harm be in allowing a conference or an institution to license a photographer for a limited amount of time to be paid a fair wage to create these photographs and then be allowed to sell them.

Certainly, most institutions don't have the staff to manage that, and conferences certainly do not.

We tried very hard to find photographers who would volunteer to donate their time and come to these events and take the pictures and simply be reimbursed for their film and developing costs. We had no success with finding people to volunteer to do that.

As conferences move in the direction of neutral sites where they are not on campuses for their championships, this becomes even more and more difficult.

What we are asking is that the legislation permit an institution or conference to simply execute a limited-time license, which any attorney for any institution or conference will tell you should include the specific requirement that all NCAA rules and regulations must be abided by. We all know, legally speaking, all licenses are of limited and specific duration.

We're asking the membership to support this legislation. It also has a significant potential financially to help Division II institutions and conferences. Thank you.

Lea Rudee (University of California, San Diego): I'm speaking in opposition to this motion, not on my basis as a faculty member, but I've been involved in the business side of photography and have also been on the board of directors of the Museum of Photographic Arts in San Diego.

I'm not against the general principle, but as written, you have to build in a lot more safeguards into this because if the photographer could be allowed to sell to advertising use in a third-party advertisement, and if you don't have all your model rights and product rights for reproduction, you could be extremely vulnerable to suits.

There was a paperwork screw-up in San Diego and a person used in an ad against their will got \$100,000 from the photographer in a suit.

So there's a whole body of problems arising the way it's currently written.

Paul Englemann (Central Missouri State University): The Legislation Committee opposes this.

We think there are very simple ways you can get around it with existing legislation. Nothing in our existing legislation would prohibit a conference, or for that matter, a member institution, from hiring a photographer, paying him for his or her services and then selling the photographs to any interested parties.

The problem is, that this allows the photographer to directly profit from taking pictures, and then selling pictures of our student-ath-

letes in action. That is the exact type of thing we have opposed all along. For that reason, we think it's simple enough to meet existing legislation by simply hiring the photographer yourself and having the conference or institution sell the photographs and get the profits from them.

[Proposal No. 30 was defeated.]

Recruiting—Advertisements

Sue Willey (University of Indianapolis): On behalf of the Legislation Committee, I would like to move Proposal 31.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal would permit institutions to place general institutional summer camp and summer school advertisements in recruiting publications in high school and two-year game programs.

Currently, legislation prohibits Division II institutions from placing advertisements designed to solicit enrollment of students in any publication considered to be recruiting publications.

Often these advertisements are purchased by the institution's admissions office without the knowledge of the athletics department, which constitutes a violation.

The Legislation Committee noted that it will still remain impermissible for institutions to purchase space for athletic advertisements or to place advertisements in publications other than those specified.

I urge your support of this proposal.

Frank Brown (Columbus State University): As a member of the Presidents Council, I rise to support this proposal.

It should be permissible for our admissions offices to purchase advertising space to solicit the enrollment of students in general, as well as to advertise summer school courses and summer camps.

These advertisements are not athletically motivated. They simply promote our institutions. This is a simple change that is time to be made. I urge your support.

James Fallis (University of Northern Colorado): I rise in concern about this legislation.

Program ads are an integral component of a high-school athletic budget. If this passes, we will be creating a scenario where university dollars become a planned part of high-school athletic budgets. High schools will use outstanding student-athletes to generate this money. We are talking about including athletically related summer camps and clinics. I don't know how you can separate the athletic dollars from this situation.

I certainly am not opposed to and would support ads in state association-sponsored programs that are sponsoring regional or state championships on campuses or off campuses. But when we get into the situation where individual high schools can come onto your campus, can talk to your coaches, go talk to your admissions office and run an ad, I think we're opening up Pandora's box.

Many coaches who worked in the admissions office are going to be swayed on an annual basis to move the advertising and admissions dollars to different areas.

This legislation is here for a purpose. Those of you who have been here for 15 years remember why we brought it in. It's a rat race. I urge its defeat.

Catherine Haker (College of Saint Rose): I also speak in opposition to this legislation and ask that my colleagues please consider the financial ramifications if this legislation is passed.

I feel this legislation runs counter to our efforts toward cost containment. Over the years, I've received one to two requests for advertising per year. This legislation will now open the door wide for such requests.

I am concerned that there will be a massive increase in solicitations of such advertisements and that our institutions will become the primary source of funding for high school and junior college programs.

I imagine that our admissions offices on our campuses already feel that they cast a broad net with their advertising budgets. I also imagine that our camp advertising budgets will need to increase drastically to keep up with the Joneses if this passes.

I urge you to defeat this legislation. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 31 was defeated, 117-123-1.]

Recruiting—Institutional Control

Mary Gardner (Bloomsburg University of Pennsylvania): On behalf of the Legislation Committee, I would like to move Proposal 32.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal will eliminate the requirement that funds expended for recruiting purposes must be deposited with the institution. Currently, it is not permissible for a coach to spend his or her own money without claiming reimbursement from the institution or submitting a gift in kind with proper documentation detailing how the donation is being spent.

Though this proposal may eliminate the requirement of funds needing to be deposited with the institution, it still remains the institution's responsibility to monitor the manner in which institutional and personal funds are expended in the recruiting purposes.

I urge you to support this proposal.

Michael Marcil (North Central Intercollegiate Athletic Conference): On behalf of the Management Council, I urge you to support Proposal 32.

Currently, coaches and institutions must document all expenditures during the recruiting process. This requires excessive paperwork. Many times, a secondary violation occurs because it's not practical for coaches to seek reimbursement for each and every personal cent they may spend when recruiting. Such a practice is not practical

when it comes to how Division II institutions fund and manage recruiting efforts.

This proposal does not eliminate institutional control and the responsibility of the institution to monitor the recruiting process; however, this proposal will allow institutions to develop their own means for documenting the personal expenditures of coaches during the recruiting process, and that is practical for Division II institutions.

John Keating (University of Wisconsin, Parkside): On behalf of the Presidents Council, I urge the delegates to support the proposal for the reasons that have been cited.

Further, I feel it is important to re-emphasize that institutions will remain responsible for the conduct of coaches and expenditures during the recruiting process.

A fundamental principle of the Association and Division II is institutional control. This proposal does not eliminate that fundamental principle; however, it will allow the monitoring of recruiting expenditures to be determined at the discretion of the institution. Therefore, I urge you to join the Presidents Council in supporting this proposal. Thank you.

Kelly Higgins (University of South Dakota): I speak in opposition to this for one very basic and philosophical reason. My good colleague, Jerry Hughes, mentioned earlier in Proposal No. 15 the need for institutional control in the membership philosophy statements. In Proposal No. 32, we in essence removed that same provision on this one item.

Currently, this is not an onerous situation to deal with the paperwork. There are three times that this is tracked on just normal business paperwork of the institution. They monitor whether they will do this or not.

I speak in opposition on the philosophical basis alone. This is simple. It's already been done. I disagree with the concept that we remove a law or bylaw because it's being violated a lot. If that was the case, there would be a lot of criminal codes that would be removed because they are violated a lot.

[Proposal No. 32 was adopted.]

Recruiting—Football Recruiting Calendar

Ralph McFillen (Mid-America Intercollegiate Athletics Association): I move Proposal No. 33.

[The motion was seconded.]

Two years ago, Division I altered its recruiting period in the spring in the sport of football. This proposal is designed to place Division II in the same time period.

As stated in the rationale, this adjusts our football recruiting period to the same as Division I. It's important for our coaches to see junior college scrimmages that are frequently designed around the Division I recruiting period, which now begins April 15, whereas our

current period does not permit evaluations until May 1.

This proposal does not extend the recruiting period beyond the present four weeks. This will create a level playing field for Division II football in recruiting student-athletes.

The immediate effective date will allow implementation for this spring recruiting period.

The Presidents Council, Management Council and Legislation Committee support this proposal. I urge your approval of this.

James Fallis (University of Northern Colorado): I have a question on Proposal 32. I'm sorry that we're past it. I would like to know if it would be possible to vote on an immediate implementation of 32?

Ms. Cormier: I've been informed by the parliamentarian, no.

Mr. Fallis: Thank you.

Ms. Cormier: Sorry.

[Proposal No. 33 was adopted.]

Eligibility—Seasons of Competition

Thomas Brown (Great Lakes Intercollegiate Athletic Conference): I move Proposal No. 34.

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent of Proposal No. 34 is just to level the playing field, as it relates to the four sports listed in the nonchampionship segment.

A person who has been red-shirted is not eligible to compete. They can practice, but not compete. Whereas, somebody who had a medical hardship would be allowed.

The intent of this proposal is to allow both red-shirts to be treated in the same way.

[Proposal No. 34 was adopted.]

Eligibility/Seasons of Competition—Hardship Waiver

Sharon Taylor (Lock Haven University of Pennsylvania): On behalf of the Legislation Committee, I move Proposal 35.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal will specify that a student-athlete's eligibility for medical hardship waiver should be determined by the number of scheduled contests or dates of competition, rather than the number of completed contests or dates of competition.

Current legislation leaves student-athletes uncertain as to whether they will be granted a medical hardship waiver until the end of the playing season. This proposed change would provide the injured student-athletes with more certainty as to the outcome of his or her medical hardship waiver.

Additionally, from an administrative perspective, determining the first half of the playing season based on scheduled contests and dates of competitions will eliminate the inequitable results that occur when games are canceled due to circumstances beyond the control of the institution or the student-athletes.

This proposal will allow for a more straightforward and consis-

tent administration of the medical hardship waiver, and I urge your support.

[Proposal No. 35 was adopted.]

**Playing and Practice Seasons—
Weekly Hour Limitations—Football**

Jerry Vandergriff (Angelo State University): On behalf of the Legislation Committee, I move 36.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal will permit student-athletes in the sport of football to view a maximum of two hours of game film per week as part of the permissible eight hours of required weight-training and conditioning activities that may occur during the academic year outside of the playing season.

As the legislation presently reads, football is the only sport in which student-athletes are not provided an opportunity for skill instruction outside the playing season during the academic year. Although watching the game film is not equivalent to skill instruction, it does allow for an alternative means to address skill improvement.

I strongly urge you to support this proposal.

[Proposal No. 36 was adopted.]

Preseason Practice Start Date—Golf

Thomas Brown (Great Lakes Intercollegiate Athletic Conference): I move Proposal No. 37.

[The motion was seconded.]

We're not quite sure how Proposal 26 affects us, but there's been some conversation today about those of us who play in the northern climates. In golf, we play split seasons. Proposal 26 is going to have a limitation on that, we feel. This is another try to equal the playing field, because several of our schools start in August and some of them start in September. We're hoping to have this adopted and then see how it fits with Proposal 26.

I urge the acceptance of this.

Paul Englemann (Central Missouri State University): I am the chair of the Legislation Committee.

In your program, it states that the Legislation Committee, the Management Council and the Presidents Council support this legislation. That position has been changed to one of taking no position on it.

At the time this originally came up, it was felt that Proposition 26, if it were adopted, would render these two motions moot. If 26 failed, we were certainly willing to provide golf the same kind of relief that had been provided to other sports. However, Letter D in Proposition 26 gives these institutions the opportunity to declare golf a fall sport and deal with it by beginning practice as early as August 10 if they want and then run under the same restrictions everyone

else runs under for their spring semester, where they would have a 45-day window and 24 days of countable athletically related activities.

For that reason, these three bodies have withdrawn their support of this motion.

[Proposal No. 37 was adopted, 125-77-29.]

First Date of Competition—Golf

Thomas Brown (Great Lakes Intercollegiate Athletic Conference): I move Proposal 38.

[The motion was seconded.]

No. 38 just follows 37 with the first date of competition. We're proposing that the first date would be September 1, or the preceding Friday of September if September 1 falls on a Saturday or Sunday.

We urge acceptance of this.

[Proposal No. 38 was adopted.]

Committees—Division II Student-Athlete Advisory Committee—Vacancies

Michael Marcil (North Central Intercollegiate Athletic Conference): On behalf of the Management Council, I would like to move Proposal 39.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal will increase the number of nominations required to be submitted by a Division II conference from two to four for vacancies on the national Student-Athlete Advisory Committee.

The goal of greater committee diversity will be accomplished by increasing the pool of eligible candidates for consideration. Finding four athletes willing to serve for all conference member institutions is not an undue burden.

I urge your support of this proposal.

Kay Schallenkamp (Emporia State University): As a member of the Presidents Council and as a liaison to the National Student-Athlete Advisory Committee, I urge your support of Proposal 39.

The requirement of conferences to nominate four individuals to the national Student-Athlete Advisory Committee, will increase the pool of candidates for consideration and will allow for greater diversity in gender, ethnicity and sport.

Further, this will allow more student-athletes to express an interest in being involved in the Division II governance process.

I urge your support of this proposal.

Stephanie Harris (St. Leo University): I'm here to represent the Division II Student-Athlete Advisory Committee.

The Division II Student-Athlete Advisory Committee supports Proposal No. 39. In compliance with the mission statement of the Division II Student-Athlete Advisory Committee, this proposal will enhance the diversity on our committee in regard to gender, ethnicity and sport.

With the increased number of nominees that we have seen recently in some conferences, we know that more nominees can change the face of our committee. With hundreds of student-athletes in each of our conferences, we believe that it is reasonable to expect that four nominations from each conference can be obtained.

Therefore, the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee would welcome your support on this proposal.

Nathan Salant (Gulf South Conference): We are very much in favor of the concept of having diversity and a greater pool of candidates; however, history can sometimes teach a very good lesson.

We struggled to find a second candidate the first two times that our opening existed. We struggled again this year. It's not lack of interest on the part of our administrations or our member institutions. In listening to the commissioners in our meetings, this was not just one conference or two conferences that had this problem.

The current legislation requiring two does not mandate that you may only submit two. We are concerned that increasing this number is going to place more and more difficulty on coming up with people, getting student-athletes who are talked into doing it and will not necessarily make the commitment or pressuring institutions to find somebody so that we can get something done.

We think that two is sufficient. By all means, if you have more than two, continue to submit them.

[Proposal No. 39 was adopted.]

Ms. Cormier: This is a very hard-working group of people.

We're not going to take a break. I need to ask you if you would like to have a window of reconsideration on Proposals 30 to 39?

Dianthia Ford-Kee (Shaw University): I would like a point of clarification on Proposal No. 24. I was confused and so were several others around me regarding the vote, thinking that it was necessary to defeat Proposal 24 by a "no" vote. We didn't understand that at the time, a "yes" vote was necessary to support the reconsideration. Several people around me also conveyed the same sentiment.

Secondly, we weren't clear whether a majority or a two-thirds vote was required for reconsideration.

Thirdly, for some, it was a perception that we were voting on the actual proposal. Again, I would like to have a point of clarification.

Parliamentarian Fitzgerald: Number one, it's a simple majority for the motion to reconsider to pass.

Two, it was our feeling here that the chair made it clear that the vote was on the motion to reconsider and that if that motion passed, then the original Proposal No. 24 would be back before the membership for a vote. If it failed, as it did by some 34 votes, then that would be the end of it. It should not be reconsidered.

While we apologize if there was any confusion, it would seem that the majority of the members here present understood what the vote the chair was calling for involved and what the next procedure was.

Ms. Cormier: Is there anyone else who would like to bring forth

anything on a window of reconsideration, particularly for Proposals 30 to 39? Hearing none, we will move to an open forum.

I would like to turn this meeting over to Lisa Colvin and the Championships Committee for a discussion on Division II championships issues. We'll have a very short question-and-answer session. After that, we will open the floor to delegates for any general comments or questions.

Lisa.

OPEN FORUM

Lisa Colvin (Southern Arkansas University): Good morning. We're saving the best for last. I am an associate professor and the senior woman administrator at Southern Arkansas University, which you now know is the home of the Mule Riders. I'm also the vice-chair of the Management Council and the chair of the Championships Committee.

Today's agenda includes many topics we would like to share with the membership and guests who are present with us regarding the Division II championships. We also will provide you with an opportunity to ask questions of the committee.

The topics we plan to present include what you see on the overhead. They include 2001 championships season; past accomplishments of the Championships Committee; the strategic plan; championships equity report; sports festival; marketing/promotions game plan; YES clinics; student-athlete participation surveys; regionalization philosophy; selection criteria/strength of schedule; as well as a question-and-answer session.

Joining me on the panel today are Rita Castagna, director of athletics at Assumption College; Pete Chapman, director of athletics at Missouri Western State College; Ed Harris, director of athletics at West Texas A&M University; and David Riggins, director of athletics at Mars Hill College.

These members of the Championships Committee have done an exceptional job working with the Presidents Council, the Management Council, all of the sports committees and you, the membership, regarding an array of issues.

Before I continue, also listed on the overhead are a list of all the members of the Championships Committee. I would like to introduce to you the remaining members of the committee. I would like for those members to stand so the membership can see you.

Don Amiot, director of athletics, Minnesota State University-Mankato; Lynda Goodrich, director of athletics, Western Washington University; Tom Kearns, professor of mathematics, Northern Kentucky University; Monique Morgan, assistant commissioner, Central Intercollegiate Athletic Association; Nancy Simpson, director of athletics, California State University, San Bernardino; and Hindman Wall, University of Tampa.

Please give them a hand. (Applause)

The 2001 championship season was definitely memorable. More than 11,000 student-athletes participated in NCAA championships this past year. They all had one common goal among them—to become a champion in his or her sport.

Let's take a look back at some of the images of the 2001 championship.

[Note: The delegates viewed a videotape.]

Ms. Colvin: Like many of you, I had an opportunity to witness a number of championships. I did have the privilege of attending 11 championships last year, so I was on the road a good bit. I wanted to do that as chair of the Championships Committee to get to the events.

I was excited to see our student-athletes perform at their sporting competitions. We commend all of you who had student-athletes involved in the championships. (Applause)

The Championships Committee has been involved in several new incentives over the past few years. Some of those past accomplishments include the ones that you see listed: Mementos valued at \$50 for student-athletes involved in finals; bracket and squad size increases for several sports; increase in officials fees and travel expenses; golf regional reimbursement; the elimination of geographic proximity; and the establishment of women's golf, lacrosse, and rowing championships.

We are pleased with the strides that have been made; however, the committee is poised to continue working to ensure that the championships experience is memorable for every student-athlete involved.

The committee is looking at several other initiatives for the next several years. Issues such as men's and women's basketball expansion; per diem reimbursement for men's and women's tennis regionals; reimbursement for both indoor and outdoor track and field; and per diem increases are under discussion in the governance structure.

One of the goals of the Championships Committee was to review championship participation opportunities for student-athletes. We are happy to report that several steps have been taken to bring the percentage of males and females participating closer together.

As you can see from the slide above, the percentage of participants in NCAA championships, including regional competition, is virtually 50/50.

The committee also approved the concept of a Division II sports festival. The festival will take place May 7 through the 16 of 2004. The committee believes that the event could take place once every four years.

Currently, under the teams that we have included, 600 student-athletes are scheduled to be involved. The sports that will be involved initially include men's and women's golf, men's and women's tennis, women's lacrosse, and women's softball.

The request for proposals will be distributed to potential hosts

next month. Numerous cities have expressed interest in the festival. The committee is requesting that the RFPs be returned by June of 2002. The site determination will be made in September.

If you know of any cities that may be interested in hosting this event, please contact Sharon Cessna at the NCAA national office.

I would like to ask Dave Riggins to discuss marketing, YES clinics and the student-athlete survey.

David Riggins (Mars Hill College): One of the new initiatives is a marketing/promotion plan. The purpose of the plan is to assist several championships increase attendance: women's basketball, football, men's and women's soccer, and men's and women's track and field were selected for funding in this pilot program. The committee's implementation date is 2002-03.

The committee is reviewing the possibility of having a pilot program for Division II YES clinics for 2003-2004 and 2004-2005. The Championships Committee will review the proposal at its January meeting.

In 2003-2004, the NCAA Division II national championship spring sports festival will be the site of the spring clinic.

The NCAA is in its second year of administering a student-athlete survey for all its championships. Of course, we know that student-athletes are our best source of information regarding championships. The purpose of the survey is to assist the NCAA staff, sports committees and the Championships Committee in evaluating a student-athlete's championship experience.

Some of the highlights of last year's survey results include: 83 percent of those student-athletes rated facilities good to very good; 76 percent preferred predetermined sites; 63 percent said they would like the opportunity to interact with student-athletes from opposing teams; 98.2 percent said they would participate in the event again; 55 percent said they would prefer an interactive event, especially the banquet, as opposed to listening to a speaker.

I would like to turn the podium over to Ed Harris.

Ed Harris (West Texas A&M University): I promised my conference when I came up here that I wouldn't talk long, so I'll try to keep this brief.

My part of this is to cover the regionalization philosophy. As most of you know, Division II has subscribed to the regionalization philosophy for selecting teams to our championships. This philosophy has been used in the majority of our Championship Committees.

The philosophy comprises the following elements, and those are on your screen: Selecting a predetermined number of teams from each region; evaluation based upon regional competition; encouraging member institutions to compete against opponents within the region; equal numbers are referred for each region, with the exception of men's and women's cross country, and men's and women's golf, whose allocations depend on the number of teams in a region and performance in the previous competition; and preliminary rounds

paired in the region.

Those are the concepts, basically, we're working with.

Selection criteria. All three divisions use three similar selection criteria. One is one won/lost record; second is strength of schedule; and eligibility of available student-athletes.

Division II also puts in a .500 percentage in won-lost record against Division II opponents.

The Championships Committee is reviewing the selection criteria for all sports. All sports committees are asked to publicize their selection criteria.

I'll pass it on now to Pete Chapman.

Peter Chapman (Missouri Western State College) : One of the things that the Championships Committee has asked the sports committees to do this past year is to review strength of schedule. Since it is used in selection in all of our championships, one of the things that the committee wanted to do was to make sure that we had a definition very specific to each sport saying what strength of schedule would be and then to publicize that. Right now, we just list it in there as strength of schedule.

Later on this month when the Championships Committee meets, we're going to take a look and review each one of the sports committees' definitions of strength of schedule. We plan to have all of those strength of schedule definitions and how they are used implemented by the fall of 2002.

The Championships Committee has a full agenda for this coming meeting on January 27 through the 30, partially because of the tragic events of September 11. A lot of the budgetary items that we were supposed to deal with in our September meeting were not done due to the fact that we had phone conferences. So therefore, a lot of the budgetary decisions that Lisa went over are going to be given attention at this meeting.

I'll turn it back over to Lisa.

Ms. Colvin: Thank you, Pete.

This concludes our presentation. We would like to open it up for questions and answers. I'll try to facilitate that.

Ralph McFillen (Mid-America Intercollegiate Athletics Association): I would like to ask the Championships Committee if they have made a determination of the value of strength of schedule, versus won-/lost record.

It's a concern of mine that many times when formulas are developed for different sports that there is an overemphasis or overweight given to won-lost record in that it's measured on multiple occasions—i.e., won-lost record, in-region record, et cetera.

It would be my recommendation that the Championships Committee develop a maximum of how much weight could be given to, in this particular case won-lost record, because I think if you look at what is done in many other sports out of Division II, that when you look at RPIs and other things that develop, that strength of schedule

carries more weight than won-lost record. I'm concerned that in Division II we're going to reverse that trend and have too much weight placed on won-lost record by giving measurements of equal weight in won-lost record, in-region record, et cetera.

I would ask the committee to review that and maybe make a statement if there could be one reached by your committee that won-lost record would not ever comprise more than 50 percent of a measurement tool that is being used for the different sports in developing their formulas.

Mr. Chapman: The committee in the January meeting will review all these different strength of schedules from all the different committees. That's one of the things that we're going to be taking a look at—how that is all put together and try to come up with some things that we think are fair in terms of access to regional competition.

Ed Harris (West Texas A&M University): One other thing that I would mention that might make you feel better, is that basketball—I won't say the basketball system is perfect—is a prototype for what we're looking at. What you're addressing in terms of strength of schedule is addressed in their format. They are given points based on their strength of schedule and what other people do on won-lost record, not solely on the person that's being selected to the championship criteria.

Ralph McFillen (Mid-America Intercollegiate Athletics Association): My problem with basketball is it weighs won-lost record at two-thirds, instead of strength of schedule. You give equal weight to overall won-lost, you give equal weight to in-region record, and you give equal weight to strength of schedule. That's two-thirds won-lost record, versus strength of schedule.

If you look at what the Division I RPI is, it's the opposite. Men's and women's basketball, we have the same sport—Division I, Division II. Your measurement is the opposite. In Division I, the RPI is two-thirds strength of schedule, one-third won-lost record.

That's why I think there has been an over-emphasis on won-lost record because you count it multiple times. I just don't believe you would ever give won-lost record any more weight than 50 percent. It probably should be less if you want to use the Division I RPI as a guide.

I suggest and recommend that the Championships Committee not buy into the formula currently being used in basketball as the guide because, in my personal opinion, it is overweighted in the won-lost record area.

Mr. Harris: Yes, I understand that, and you're exactly right.

The good news is that championships has mandated that in every sport, including basketball, that they re-evaluate their selection criteria.

I think right now that conversation is one that I would encourage you to have with the sports committees, because we will see that new

list of criteria when it comes from the individual sports committee. So that's our initial place to look.

Phillip Roach (Rollins College): Speaking of strength of schedule, I'd like you to speak to golf and the concept of 50 percent of your schedule against Division II. For institutions in our area, that will be weakening our schedule. I don't think that's in the best interests of our student-athletes.

That policy will also cost our institutions more money for travel if, in fact, we are not to play the same institutions every week.

Lisa Colvin (Southern Arkansas University): That concludes the question-and-answer session for championships. I'll turn it back to Dr. Cormier.

Ms. Cormier: Thank you very much to the Championships Committee. We know how hard you're working on all this. Thank you for your presentation today.

Are there any other general comments or questions that we should discuss before the Convention?

Phillip Roach (Rollins College): I'm sorry. I asked a question. I thought there might be a response.

In our area, many golf programs are competing largely against Division I institutions. The new legislation will not permit that. In fact, it will weaken our schedule in light of what my colleague Mr. McFillen just mentioned. From what I hear from the dais, strength of schedule is important. I would like you to speak about that proposal, that policy of 50 percent.

Peter Chapman (Missouri Western State College): We're looking at regionalization for Division II athletics. We understand that people compete against Division I and all that. As for the 50-percent rule, I think that the golf committee, when they put that together, actually made provisions in terms of the tournaments to have so many Division II schools in them in meeting that 50-percent criteria.

We're taking a look at that one again at our meeting in January to make sure, because this is the first year that we'll be going into that new regionalization for golf.

Kelly Higgins (University of South Dakota): Phil's got a very good question. I think the response with the basketball championship as the model, while it's not my favorite model in the world, as some people know, it is a good model when you think about the fact that in the current criteria, I believe at Division II, or higher in Division I, it is considered part of the strength of schedule. Am I correct? So shouldn't that apply as well with the golf discussion that Phil has? Just a question of point.

Mr. Chapman: Initially, it comes from the sports committee. That change came from the basketball committee. The sports committee presents those to the Championships Committee. That's the avenue to go through for that.

The one point I want to make, when the Championships Committee asks for all the sports committees to turn in to us what

they were using as a definition of strength of schedule, whether it would be golf, whether it would be football, whatever else, we had several committees told us we have no definition of strength of schedule.

So we're starting from a point where, in some cases, we have no definition of what strength of schedule is. There's no formula. There's no anything.

Basketball at least has progressed to a point where they have something that points to strength of schedule. That sports committee has been tweaking that for the last couple of years trying to come up with what is a good way to work with it. Some of these other committees haven't had anything.

In response to Mr. McFillen's comments about whether 50 percent here or 50 percent there, that's a continuation of that tweaking of that particular thing.

So the sports committees are the initial people who pass along legislation. What we're having frustration with is it's not getting passed along.

Mr. Higgins: I hear your frustration, and I agree with it. I'm agreeing that the basketball model presents the idea to meet Phil's question. I'm trying to agree with you here. That's all I'm saying.

Mr. Chapman: You're just trying to be on the microphone more than . . .

Mr. Higgins: No. You know me better than that.

Ms. Cormier: We appreciate your issue.

Please note that these people have e-mail, and you may e-mail them. May they not? Yes, yes, you may. I want to be sure you get that information, as well.

Are there any other comments or general areas of discussion?

Jerry Hughes (Central Missouri State University): I would like to take this opportunity before we adjourn to thank Jim Johnson, who has worked with the Division II Management Council and who is going to be leaving the Association very soon, as well as Bob Oliver, who has served Division II for a number of years in membership services.

Both of those two have done an outstanding job in answering our questions for Division II, as well as working with the Management Councils and Presidents Councils to expedite our meetings and make us understand the legislation very well.

I would like for all of us to give those two individuals a round of applause. (Applause)

Ms. Cormier: Jim, if I'd known you were leaving, I would not have accepted this role. You should have told me ahead of time.

Thank you, everyone, for your attention.

Michael Marcil (North Central Intercollegiate Athletic Conference): At this time, I would like to recognize all the hard work that Jerry Hughes has done over the past year as chair of the NCAA Management Council. It's been a tremendous year. We very much are going to miss all his leadership, but we appreciate the impact he's

had on Division II.

I would like to give Jerry Hughes a round of applause right now.
(Applause)

I would also like to mention that the first meeting of the incoming Management Council will be moved from tomorrow morning to this afternoon at 3. We're asking all the Management Council members and the incoming members to assemble in the Capitol Ballroom at 3 this afternoon. Thank you.

Ms. Cormier: I want to thank all of the delegates for your attention. One of the things that I've learned about this Division II group is that you not only work hard, but you work smart. This is a governance system that is truly collaborative. It involves a great many people, not only the individuals who are in this room, but a great many people on your campuses. It's a great collaboration between chief executive officers and FARs and SWAs and athletic directors and commissioners and coaches and, of course, students. Students who are the prize. I hope they will always be the prize. I hope they will always be our focus.

I'd like you to take an opportunity now with me to thank the SAAC committee. We have several members of this group who are leaving this year. I had the privilege of working one on one with them a few years ago and miss them very much.

Let's give a round of applause for our SAAC members. (Applause)

I'd also like to thank our staff again—Mike Racy, Jan Brown and Ruth Reinhardt, and all of the people within our staff group for the diligence and the kind of dedicated service that they have.

Please peel the sticker off of your voting units, and leave your voting units on the table in front of you before you leave the ballroom. I know you have no other use for them. You don't need them in federal elections. They are going to have new machines for all of that.

Thank you all very much. We'll see you in Anaheim next year.
[The Division II Business Session was adjourned at 12:15 p.m.]

(

(

(

■ Division III Forum

Sunday Afternoon, January 13, 2002

The Division III Forum was called to order at 1:30 p.m., with Presidents Council Chair Tom Courtice presiding.

OPENING REMARKS

Mr. Courtice: We're glad you're all here. It is my responsibility to offer a welcome to this Division III Issues Forum. My name is Tom Courtice. I'm president at Ohio Wesleyan University and currently the chair of the Division III Presidents Council. There are two others on the platform with me this afternoon. One, Dr. James Shulman, whom I will introduce in just a minute. The other is Joy Reighn, director of athletics at Rowan University and chair of the Division III Management Council.

This is a perfect opportunity for me to be able to thank Joy on all of our behalf for her leadership and her commitment to Division III over the past year in her capacity as Management Council chair. (Applause.) Thank you, Joy. You can hear that your efforts have been appreciated.

We are conducting the fifth Division III issues forum as a part of our Convention session. Each year, we've taken time to focus on issues that are of particular importance to student-athletes. Moreover, this forum is consistent with our division's strategic plan, which places special emphasis on the issues of student-athlete welfare and membership education, and our division's philosophy statement, which places the highest priority on the overall quality of the student-athlete's educational experience.

With the help of our Student-Athlete Advisory Committee, we've identified two topics that we hope will capture your interest over the next couple of hours. Both will retain our focus on positive relationships between student-athletes, coaches, faculty and administration. I should also express gratitude to the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee and Convention Planning Committee for their help in this regard. They've made this program focused and very worthwhile.

We've also again this year seated you at round tables in an attempt to foster greater dialogue and interaction. We also have attempted to have a student-athlete or a member of the Management Council at each table to ensure that these discussions will be as relevant and beneficial as possible. I hope that will be the case and you might sort yourselves out a little bit when we get to that part of the program. We will be together for the next 2 ½ hours and we'll move directly from the first topic to the second.

I am happy to introduce Dr. James Shulman. He and his colleague, Bill Bowen, authored the book *The Game of Life*. James

Shulman is the chief financial and administrative officer at the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation. He has served in a number of capacities, including the building of the "College and Beyond" database and participated in subsequent research on higher education, assisted in the management of the foundation's endowment, and is currently leading the foundation's initiative in creating digital resources for the study of art, a very creative project.

Dr. Shulman earned a B.A. and a Ph.D. from Yale in renaissance studies. His dissertation was the basis for his book *The Pale Cast of Thought*. In addition to collaborating on the book *The Shape of the River*, Dr. Shulman and Bill Bowen again coauthored the 2001 release of *The Game of Life: College Sports and Educational Values*.

Earlier today, he spoke to a group of Division II and Division III college presidents. We're pleased that he has agreed to extend his visit to provide us with what I'm sure will be thought-provoking remarks on his findings and to engage us in discussion on the culture of Division III athletics. It's a real privilege for me to present James Shulman. Jim. (Applause.)

James Shulman: Thank you. And thank you all for being here. I'm going to go over major findings in the book. I'm going to do this because I made the mistake once of believing somebody when they said you don't have to go over the book because everybody out there knows the book. So I said: "Well, since everybody knows the book, are there any questions?" Everyone sat there for about 45 minutes. So I'm going to give you a little tour of the book. If some of you have heard this before, I apologize. I hope to talk for no more than 25 minutes and then have conversation.

I'm going to start off with the obligatory funny story. It's more special because I can see the athletic director of the school in question from where I stand. About five years ago when I started working on this study, I got a call. I was sitting in my office, and a management consultant calls and said: "I work for Boston Consulting Group, and we're doing a study on X college and we're gathering a lot of data and we're going to look at athletics and alumni and financial aid and retirement issues. It's going to be an empirical factor and it's going to be done in four weeks."

I said: "Wow, that's very impressive." And he said: "So I need some data on sports." "Well, I'll try to help you, but we're just starting and it's a big job and we're doing a big survey. It's going to take a couple of years, probably." And he said: "Oh, well, that's too long because I'm trying to turn this around. Are there any early conclusions?" I said: "Not really because it's early on." So he said: "Well, you know, the data are so much more powerful than all the scattered anecdotes." I said: "I agree completely"

He said: "For example, I went to Harvard." I said: "Harvard?" "If Harvard beats Yale in a game, alumni giving goes up 16 to 18 percent." I said: "Wow, that's interesting. That's tough to figure out. I mean, how do you control for different variables and who's having a

campaign and who's got a new president and all those? How do you control all those? Plus, I think those data are pretty hard to get to. Where do you get those data?" He said: "One of the coaches told me." (Laughter.)

So we don't have all the answers. But we're trying to gather a little more data and do things a little more carefully than that.

What I'd like to do today, as Tom said, is have a conversation about the notion of an athletic culture. When this book was first circulated among some knowledgeable readers, I got a lot of feedback saying there isn't an athletic culture. That it's an overarching statement that's reckless and what you should talk about are different cultures—even different cultures and subcultures. I still think that that's going too far.

I wrote this book, so I don't agree with that. But I think there is a culture. I think as with most cultures that one can identify, there are norms and values and practices and mores that I think make it a culture. I think how one interprets the eligibility of that culture will make a very fruitful conversation today. Because I have no doubt that there's good culture and I have no doubt that there's bad culture. But I think how one decides what's good, what's bad, and what the elements are is for all of us to keep doing for the rest of our lives. So I'm going to go to these slides now with any luck.

I'm going to start with the easy part—describing the study. Starting in 1994, we started to gather data from 30 different colleges and universities. Let me say at the beginning, this is not a representative sample of colleges and universities. This does not address the whole NCAA; it does not address Division III very well; it certainly doesn't address Division II.

What we started to do was good for what it did and not good for a whole bunch of other purposes, but we decided to take a group of schools that were known as leaders throughout higher education and we were coherent in terms of the academically selective places. So we had Stanfords and the Dukes and the Michigans and the Chapel Hills. We have Williamsses and Wesleyans and Swarthmores, and some Ivy Leagues and Bryn Mawrs and Wellesleys. We started with a group of schools that were similar in terms of how they did their academics but very different in terms of how they did the sports. So that is one of the big limitations of our study, but we had to start somewhere.

This is how we did it. We gathered data on individual students. We worked with the institutions to build a database about students who started college in 1951, 1976 and 1989—every single student who went to those schools. We had data on admissions, data on what they did in college, what they majored in, and then a follow-up survey of what they did later in life—jobs and civic involvement and what they think of college looking back. We spent a lot of money and a lot of time to get a higher response rate so you didn't just hear from the happy, cheery people. We have 90,000 students in the database.

This is something you all know very well, which is the percentage of students on the different campuses who participated in intercollegiate athletics. These are all letter winners. That's how we did participation. As you see, the Division I publics, 5 percent of the colleges at 32 percent. So when we talk later about culture, if we're talking about 32 percent of that, and it looks like 19 percent are women, that, of course, is going up since this 1989 cohort. There's a sizable chunk of the population who's participating in a certain activity. Now, that doesn't mean in and of itself that there are coherent characteristics to this clump. But I think the starting place is that we're talking about on the Division III campuses, what can be a fair amount of people.

One obvious thing, but I guess not obvious to parts of the world, is that if athletics is taken as a factor in admissions and you're going to get an advantage, presumably that advantage is countering other disadvantages in admission. Here we see a slide that shows the differences in SATs. This is prerecentering. A player is by sport at the coed liberal arts colleges in our study. So starting at the other end, it's football, tennis, basketball, wrestling, ice hockey. That line is about 100 to 120 points. Then you see smaller differences in some of the other sports.

Then for women these are now by division. Division I-A public, private, Ivys, coed, women's college. So they're clumped together. You see the women's colleges have a slight difference between athletes and others that coed colleges is about 30 points. So not too big at this point.

There are very, very different issues between the big-time sports issues and the Division III college issues. I don't want to be blurring that over in any way by talking about what I see as problems or issues or negatives in the Division III world. However, one of the points of our book and one of the things that I'm trying to say is that this is a continuum. These are not completely separate universes that have nothing to do with each other. I think this is one interesting way to look at it.

These are the men from our 1989 cohorts. The red bars represent those who played high-profile sports—football, basketball and ice hockey. The yellow bar are lower-profile sports, which are all the other sports. The blue bar is what we call students at large. I know this sounds like a term of art, but the reason we call them students at large is because as we all know, there are a lot of intramural sports, a lot of club sports on campus. There are a lot of people who played high-school sports. We break down some of those divisions in different places. We didn't want to call them nonathletes or nonstudent-athletes or something like that.

This looks at the percentage of men who finish in the bottom third of their class. At the Division I-A private—the second group over—there you see Notre Dame and Rice and Vanderbilt and Tulane and Stanford. You see that 81 percent of the men finished in the bot-

tom third of their class in those high-profile sports; 53 percent of the men in the other sports; and then 35 percent of just men at large.

I don't think people find that terribly surprising. What I think people were surprised about to some degree is that the Ivy Leagues, in the next set of columns, and at the other liberal arts colleges, you have 69 percent of the men in the high-profile sports finishing in the bottom third of their class and then a higher percentage also of the other kids playing sports.

Let me be perfectly clear. Graduation rates for kids who play sports, men and women, on these campuses are through the roof. They're higher than the rest of the student population. At this point, they're not that much higher because a very high percentage of their class is graduating. But this is a beneath-the-radar look at the graduation students. This is digging a little deeper.

These are the figures for women. You see that the women in the Ivy League universities are appreciably more likely than the nonathletes to be in the bottom third of the class. At the colleges at this point, it's pretty similar. This has changed since 1976. Remember, we have a good deal of women who were playing intercollegiate athletics being added through the 1970s. But at that point, the percentage of women who were in the bottom third of their class who played sports were lower than their peers. And at this point it's second to the largest and getting higher.

If you're predicted to finish in the bottom third, it's not such a big surprise. In other words, if you have lower SAT scores or lower high-school grades and if you finish lower in your class, that goes along with what would be predicted. One of the other things we've looked at is what's called underperformance—when students don't perform as well academically as would be predicted based on those admissions qualifications.

I pick on the Ivy League because that's a slide I have. This is a chart of Ivy League football players represented by the red dots versus a sample distribution of other Ivy League men represented by the blue dots. The bottom line represents SAT scores and the left side designates rank in class. The blue line represents the best male students at large. So 1,300 SATs on average are predicted to finish in the 50th percent of the class.

As you can see with the red line, there's a consistent gap. So what we get here is what we call underperformance. This is a simplistic representation of it rather than the regression analysis that we ran. But what you see here are all these red dots in along here at the bottom in the 1,300s and 1,400s. These are very talented kids. They graduate and they're doing fine in life, but they're pulling that red mean line down below what would be predicted for their peers.

Culture is beyond just academics. Obviously, when we're talking about college, we're talking about grades—and that's more important; I think we should do that. But when I talk about an athletic culture, this is another element. I like this slide because this can be pre-

sented in a fairly neutral way. I've been accused of being a Commie pinko, that no one should earn money, saying things like that, because I put up slides like this and people say that I'm presenting it negatively. There can be a negative here; there can be a positive here.

But this shows very clearly, this is from a survey taken as students got on campus. This is men only. But this is men across these different divisions. How important of a goal is it for you in life to be very well off financially? What you see here is that the pattern at the coed colleges is like the pattern at the Ivy Leagues and the pattern at the big-time colleges. The kids who were coming to campus and going to play sports are more likely to say that this is a very important goal in life.

At these colleges—and we can ignore the Ivys and just look at the liberal arts colleges on the right of the screen—we had high-profile, low-profile, and students at large. There are business majors. So what one does with these aspirations of making more money is find the closest thing one can find to a business major, whether it be economics or political science. So you see a pattern here of athletes choosing those majors that they think will help them fulfill their goal.

Again, to me, there's an element of a common culture—not only best friends who are social scientists, but co-authors who are social scientists. I try to be a social scientist myself. So this is not a bad thing or a good thing. It's just a pattern of difference and an indication to me of a different campus culture.

One of the things that becomes very clear in our research is that athletes earn more money after college. We can talk about how much of this is due to the differences that were there before they got to college and the differences that they make in career choices. But when cards are on the table, athletes are earning more money. This happens from every group of athletes from the liberal arts colleges to big-time sports. It is not affected or skewed by a few people winning million-dollar NFL contracts or anything like that. People pursue careers that are likely to give them better earnings and they get better earnings.

What I think is very interesting—this is the 1976 cohort where people have time to live life a little bit by the time of the survey—is two things. One, that the earnings bonus that Division III men get is a percentage basis higher than any other level. So the fact that you earn more money or that guys who play sports earn more money is not contributable at all to how many fans are in the stands or how many games you have or how many weeks a year you practice or anything like that. It also has nothing to do with winning percentage. We checked it against whether people on winning teams make more money and they don't. There's no difference.

What's interesting is that the women athletes from the '76 cohort also end up earning more money. But they didn't have any precollege aspirations to earn more money. Their aspirations and values and goals about how much money they wanted to earn were exactly the

same as the men. So I think that's an interesting juxtaposition.

This is my favorite slide. Let's look to the left side of this—post-college. This is from a follow-up survey we did where we asked people: "How important in your life since college have the following things been?" We asked if it was important to work well with others, work with people of different races and backgrounds, ability to adapt to change, competition is one of the things we asked about. When you look at this picture, you see high-profile, low-profile, and students at large and you see the competition is off the charts for athletes based on the level of intensity.

So when I hear the argument or people saying to me the reason that—and let's keep it to Division III—the reason that athletics fits well in the Division III culture is that—and Tom Garity calls it the sweatiest of the liberal arts—it's teaching you to compete in a competitive world. You might be reading Shakespeare in the classes but you're learning how to compete. Then you look at this slide and say absolutely. It works. These guys played sports and now they're more competitive.

Except when you look at the right side of this slide, you see their answer is the same before they started college. So this says to me if you recruit competitive people, you are at the end of four years going to have competitive people. And if what you really want to do is use college sports as a way of training kids at our college to become more competitive, the people who should be out there running sprints are the people represented in the blue bar, because they're the ones coming in less competitive.

I guess we could tie this into culture by talking about what the alumni feel. So I'll do it and I'll try to move a little more quickly through the slides. These are the views of the alumni. Again, how much emphasis does your school currently place on teaching undergrads along with all these other characteristics and all of these other activities? We asked how much do you wish your school placed on that activity, how much emphasis? Then when we subtracted the two, you see that these are all schools, all years, men and women combined. Of course, everyone wants more emphasis on teaching undergraduates; residential life; intellectual freedom; extracurricular activities; more liberal arts education; diversity. Then we get a lot less emphasis on alumni concerns, on faculty concerns about intercollegiate athletics.

This is the first starting place for me. The question is why do we have auditoriums and why do we have to win and why do we have to move up another level? The answer comes back that the alumni are demanding it. I think that some of us in this room have dealt with trustee committees or special committees or an alumni group that is upset about one thing or the other. We realize that there certainly is a constituency for whom an athletic program or a winning athletic program is the one and only priority. But when you look at the alumni at large, that's not what they're saying.

If we break this down by sector, we see that this is the strongest at the big-time public schools and at the liberal arts colleges. There's still a negative view on how much emphasis should be placed on athletics, but it's definitely coming down—or it's not as high as at the big-time places. This is where the campus culture connects to the alumni culture and then in some ways even the culture of the country at large.

Let's focus on the fourth pair over—liberal arts colleges. We break out the views of the students at large from the student-athletes. We see that at the liberal arts colleges the alumni at large want less emphasis on athletics, but the alumni people who played sports want more emphasis. That's a rather different view of things.

Then as we remember, if this is 30 percent of our population and—this remains to be proven—but if that 30 percent of our top kids would just show up on campus and are playing sports, but rather are kids who are recruited to help play sports, then this is bound to intensify over time. You're going to have more alumni who feel strongly about how this is a core part of the mission. We've all got to remember that this is sort of Nonprofits 101. Colleges and universities are nonprofits, so there's not a bottom line. Your mission is what your mission is and what it becomes and what your goals are. The impact of the alumni is something that our policies will be shaping for the future.

This is too complicated. Sorry, I don't want to bore you.

This does a better job of it. Again, the third column over, the green bar, is the views on athletics, the athletes who are alumni. Here you see that they want more emphasis on athletics. The blue bar is the views about athletics of those athletes who become alumni leaders. We know from our survey who serves on committees for the school, who serves as trustees, who serves as heads of the clubs and so forth, local clubs, everything like that.

This says that the Division III athlete alumni leaders want twice as much emphasis on athletics as the athlete alumni at large. In other words, when you as an athletic director or you as an admissions director or you as a president are hearing someone who says I'm the president of the So-and-So Club of Tampa or I'm the head of the '50s Alumni Class or whatever and here is what we want from the athletic program, here is what we think the school should be doing, I'm not saying you can't take it with a grain of salt, take it more seriously or less seriously. I'm just saying that you cannot take it as representative of your alumni body as a whole, or even of your athlete alumni body.

This one needs a little color. These are the same views of institutional priorities of the top 5 percent of donors. The top 5 percent of donors give about two-thirds of all the money. So these people are worth listening to. And what you see here is that intercollegiate athletics again, is the second one over from bottom, is still something that on average the top 5 percent of givers want less emphasis, not

more.

Let's look at this in terms of women. This is from one school. This is not the 30 schools in the study. We didn't have the data for all 30 schools. It can't be taken as completely representative, but it is indicative of a trend. These are data of all students who applied to this school, those who got in and those who didn't get in. This represents the admissions advantage you give, given the SAT score, for being an underrepresented minority, for being a legacy, for being an athlete on a coach's list.

So you see in the '70s—and this is for women, so it's just at the real birth of intercollegiate athletics in an organized NCAA light way. Of course, that didn't happen until 1980 or '81, when schools were starting to provide opportunities for women to play. Maybe there was an advantage for being a recruited athlete. By the 1989 class, the advantage was about the same. By 1999, the advantage for being on a coach's list was very high.

As I said this morning, and I want to say it to you all, the first thing I always hear when I talk about culture and athletics is to look what you're talking about, you're talking about a little piece of the phenomenon. You're talking about what colleges and universities do, whether they're big-time or little-time. You're talking about that as if that has something to do with an athletics-crazed country. In a country with ESPN and ESPN2 and ESPN11 and 12 sports stations and a country that's completely crazy about sports, as a lot of us in this room are. But you've got cause and effect mixed up.

But I think that this chart right here is very important for saying we are part of a sports-crazy culture. In other words, when you know this figure, either because you've seen our book or before you saw our book but you were worried about your kids, and you know that this advantage exists because you know who's getting in and who's not getting in, it says straight out, and I do believe in incentives and rational behavior in some ways.

It says straight out that paying \$75 an hour for the squash lesson or letting your kid be on the travel team for soccer when she's in fourth grade, even if that means driving clear across the state every Saturday, is not an irrational action. It's the perfectly thoughtful thing to do if your goal is to get your kid into college or get scholarships, or get into a place that's competitive. So I think in that way for all the good that college sports does, I think we all have to be conscious that we are setting the course. We are telling the schools what helps and what doesn't help. I think we have to be aware of that.

I'm going to go to questions now. That's it for my presentation. I don't know where we are timewise. I think I'd like to talk about the tabling if people want to. But I was assigned to come up with some questions. Where's Dan? Dan? Can I fly through these and let people think about them ahead of time and then talk about them? Great.

Here are the questions. We can tackle them in any order we want:

- Are there any specific characteristics that society perceives as

being more common among students who play sports and do these constitute a culture?

- A relationship with a coach is often the strongest and longest held relationship that a team member has in a campus community. What are the positives of this relationship? What are the negatives?

- What can be done to make sure the coaches are part of the larger campus culture?

- Do the potential benefits to be gained from participation in intercollegiate athletics—leadership, collaboration, discipline, being goal oriented—transfer to academic and campus life? If so, then how? How about the negatives?

- Is the culture of athletics the same for women as for men?

- What are the positives and negatives of specializing in one sport?

That ends on a bit of a whimper. I'm going to ask that we turn the lights up. I think people can see just fine. I'm happy to take questions in whatever way Dan and Sharon instruct me to.

Chuck Gordon (Emory University): We happen to have a nationally ranked debate program, which we're very proud of. I would suggest that if you remove athletics and put in the word debate, you have very similar results. The debaters who are on the debate coach's list are accepted at a higher rate. There would be perception among alumni who were debaters that debate should have a higher priority. There would be that same perception among alumni in advisory rolls. I think to pick athletics is okay. But I think you should also look at debate. If you substituted music, an institutional advancement list, a list of faculty staff children, and a number of other categories, I think you would see similar results.

Mr. Shulman: I'll take that challenge. In fact, I may be giving you a call about that challenge in terms of some new data collection that we are going to be doing in some places. We did work very hard to build a group of participants in other extracurricular activities. These were not necessarily who put down in the yearbook that they're running the newspaper. We identified people who were on the head of the newspaper or the yearbook, people who were in orchestra, people who were in drama but not in enough shows that it was taking time and energy.

Among that group of students, we found consistent and strong academic overperformance. I'm sure there's culture there and I'm sure there's bad to that culture too. I'm positive you're right that there's admissions advantage for different skills or attributes. But in terms of the academic part of this, that group is not underperforming academically. That's the one thing we were able to test. They end up making less money in life. Part of that, obviously, is where their interests are. In terms of the special interests among the alumni and everything like that, I think (a) that there is a culture; and (b) that there are two sides to it, too. But so far, the academic front is different.

Tom Weingartner (University of Chicago): You left out of your presentation Division III research universities. I thought they were included in your database and in the book.

Mr. Shulman: It's nice to see you. Many, many years ago I saw you I think in Dallas.

We have three research universities in the study: Washington U., Emory, and Tufts. Unfortunately, because their data on athletic participation wasn't good for the older years, we couldn't identify athletes, we weren't able to do the trends. So while the data knew the athletes were from the '89 cohort, we didn't have consistent enough data to be able to have that group in the study. That is a shame and something I would really like to do something about going forward. The University of Chicago, we referenced it for the study, but didn't have good data either.

Mr. Weingartner: So in the book, did you use data from the Division III research universities?

Mr. Shulman: We only did in terms of the finances. In that chapter, we do have information on those schools the same way we do for the other schools. But the students are not in that part of the study.

Mr. Weingartner: My one self-serving criticism would be that the disclaimer be stronger then because I think the presentation of the data is confusing and at least it suggests that those Division III research universities are included in some of your conclusions about athletic culture and the like.

Mr. Shulman: I'm sorry about that. Point taken. Because I've tried to be clear but because the schools aren't mentioned as being in the book, I can easily see how that happens. So for all the people whose lives I've made difficult in this room, I particularly apologize.

Lisa Melendy (Williams College): How did you come up with that statistic? For instance, I'm assuming for minority applicants, you looked at all applicants of color and who was admitted and who was not, and the same with legacies. But for athletes, did you look at all high-school athletes who applied and those who were admitted? Or all athletes who checked off they would like to play collegiate athletics or just the coach's list? It seems like sort of a self-selected group already that would be expected to be high to admit. I know as a coach the names I know are already very likely to come or be admitted because I've already had extensive conversations with the admissions officer and the students. So it seems very different.

Mr. Shulman: The first answer is we know about underrepresented minorities—not all minorities of any kind. These are just Hispanic and African-American applicants. We know that from the admissions table. As for the legacy data, we are familiar with about how the school classifies a legacy. For some, it is just parents, some grandparents, some if it's a great uncle or anything like that. But we just used what the school itself had.

In terms of athletics, and this is a great question, although it's a complicated question coming from—you're from Williams, right?

Ms. Melendy: Yes.

Mr. Shulman: I don't want to talk about your college in particular because it's not—

Ms. Melendy: I'm just asking about the methodology.

Mr. Shulman: I can answer it, but can't address your situation because I don't know the workings of the process. The students who are athletes who are in this pool, or tagged as athletes, are students who are on the coach's list from the schools that were participating in this part of the study. You're absolutely right, that is a presorted group of students. That is a group of students, who depending on how the coaches and the athletic department works with the admissions office, could be 100 percent.

That could happen if a school works very closely with the admissions department and has earned the trust of the admissions department and is in effect acting as admissions officers. I'm not saying you are doing that or anybody is doing that, but I'm just saying at that point, yeah, identifying the kids—and if there were only five kids or eight kids or something like that—would be a useless statistic. But the way we conducted this, we said, okay, tell us in the admissions office which kids are getting special interest or attention from the admissions department because the coach is asking to do that.

I think that's what's interesting. I'll be selfish and tie this back to the culture question. Ron Mercer doesn't get into Vanderbilt 10 years ago. There's a huge blow-up in Tennessee. Because they say what? They say he passed his boards. He fulfilled the requirements and Vanderbilt didn't take this kid who wanted to go to Vanderbilt. Why didn't they take him? At some point the coach or the school at large decided that this wasn't—and this is all public information—a good candidate for the school. So that was a big surprise because at the big-time schools it's considered that the coaches get the final call with the prerequisite that you fulfill the nationally regulated requirements. I think that if Division III moves that way, it can be done well or it can be done poorly.

Away from my long-winded story and back to my clear answer to your question. Those data are coach's list people. What are their odds of getting in? It does exist. The fact that it's higher in recent years shows that more weight is being given to that, whether that's worked out or not or how much interaction the coaches or the athletics department has with the admissions office. What it says, and this is all it says, is that it's worth your time to get on that list.

Ms. Melendy: Yet, you compare it to the minority and legacies data that's collected in a different way. It looks as if the statistical work was done the same way but then you look at all minorities in the groups that you've selected that work that applied and who were admitted. But you don't look at all interested in playing intercollegiate athletics. You only look at those who end up on the coach's list, which are very different groups. I think—and I know it's your presentation—that's inflated. It's making that soccer trip more important

than what we're trying to tell the kids it is; that being on that travel team is much less important than doing homework. Because lots of kids on travel teams will not get in based on that.

Mr. Shulman: It's not my presentation. It's our discussion. Your part of this is very welcome. You said at one point that it's statistically different. It's not different in that we ask the admissions department to tell us who you're giving special attention to in these categories. They said here are underrepresented minorities, here are our recruited athletes as you define them. So absolutely, these are not all the kids who had interaction with the coach, with the department, or came to campus. But these are the ones who have made it that far and whose talent or total package has presented itself for you, the decision-making body, to say this is a person on the list or not.

That's the hurdle. Yes, you're right, absolutely. Not everyone is going to get onto that list. You're right, it's only the right tail of the curve that's going to make it that far and for whom that investment of getting on the travel team in fourth grade is worth it. But, unfortunately, we're not rational actors in the sense that someone who's in fourth grade, and even above fourth grade, is saying, you know, I'm pretty good at soccer. I'm all-conference. I'm not all-state, but if I get my sprint time a little better, I might make that list.

It's still an incentive, even though, as you say—if we present this as saying recruited athletes or people who think of themselves as athletes or people who even had a good three conversations with the coach, that would be misleading. But we are saying those who make it this far are in pretty good shape.

Bill Gehling (Tufts University): I want to follow up on Lisa's comment. One of the most frightening elements of that slide to me is the difference in athletics between '89 and '99.

An element that I think is missed is that there is a change in the nature of communication between admissions and coaches that's considered in that time. I was a coach during that period of time and I can tell you in '89 the way in which I supplied names to admissions was quite different from '99. The significant difference was that there was far more prequalification process that took place in '99 that did not take place in '89. So in '89, if there were 30 names that I gave them, I just gave them the list of 30 and X percent got in. In '99, I may talk to them about those 30 names in a prequalification process, rule out 15 as unacceptable, and then only give them the 15 names.

So clearly, the same 30 apply but only 15 are tagged as recruited athletes. The same number gets in, but it appears to be a far higher percentage. I was wondering if you could address that. I think it makes it look like there's been a significant increase in influence when in fact I think the increase has been in communication between athletics and admissions rather than an increase in students.

Mr. Shulman: I find that a little tricky to answer. In a sense, there's nothing nefarious in improved communications that you discuss. It's your coaches' understanding better and working more close-

ly with the admissions office to say what's attractive about a kid's portfolio, what isn't, and who's more likely to make it at Tufts and to benefit most fully from the place and all that. But what that says to me is that they are acting more and more in concert with—"in concert" sounds like a conspiracy theory; I don't mean it that way—but more closely with the admissions office. In effect acting as, not as part of the admissions office but very closely with them.

To me, it still doesn't change the fundamental bottom line, which is that those kids with different backgrounds and scores and different aspirations and who are getting that much precollege attention because of their talent and prowess and focus as part of a package that works well for the institution are going to get a huge boost in admission off of a kid who does something different. At Tufts, you have the best foreign policy school in the country. Maybe the answer is that foreign policy professors should be making that sort of an out-reach effort, too.

But right now, that's a kid who's not getting into Tufts because he's just applying as somebody interested in foreign policy. His board scores may be better or whatever. But because there's no "pre-bickering" and all the attention that's going on in the recruiting and both sides of the recruiting process, that kid is at a disadvantage from the kid who's a good soccer player and talented in other ways. He's gotten into the system that works very hard to see if he or she is a good fit for the place.

One of the tough parts of my job is to avoid demonizing or villainizing or things like that. Coaches who said, wait, I'm sick of getting kids rejected or not knowing who's going to get in or anything like that, these are the ones who need to be called. Why don't we get together with them, work out a better system, here are kids who might be good. And they're doing it. And it works well.

The bottom line is that the good soccer player is still getting that much advantage over the comparably prepared foreign policy student. That's all it says. You're right, the change over time reflects the change in communication and knowledge of the system and better information and better coordination. But it still says the other thing about the advantage.

Mr. Gehling: I wouldn't dispute at all that athletics plays a significant role in the admissions process. I'm disputing the implication that that influence has grown dramatically in the last 10 years. I think the prequalification element that takes place now makes that percentage very misleading. Okay? Because that prequalification doesn't occur with minorities, it doesn't occur with legacies, it doesn't occur with others who might be pulled out of the pool and don't bother to apply.

Mr. Shulman: But these are people who applied.

Mr. Gehling: I understand that. But they're not tagged as athletes. So again, the example I used before was that there may be 30 soccer players applying to Tufts in '89. The same 30 are applying in

'99. But in '89 all 30 were tagged as athletes. In '99 only 15 are tagged as athletes. What happened to those other 15 affects your data in '89. Okay? My whole point is I think that the increase in influence that your slide implies is misleading. I know at Tufts no more athletes get in now than in '89. So that's my concern. I think it gives a misrepresentation of the change that's occurred, not that the influence exists.

Mr. Shulman: You're absolutely right about numbers. No more kids getting in. So that's right. But I think in the sense that when you say there's no more influence, I mean, again, in the abstract, take the 30 kids at Tufts making the call 10 years ago and now the admissions office is making the call in concert with your coaches more. They may be different kids. I mean, the admissions office was thinking, well, I could take the soccer player or not. And now, they've got more invested and they've worked through it and they understand the rationale why that student can make a good contribution. But the focus, even though the number of people remains the same, the size of the group isn't changing. The influence, I think, from what you're saying, is stronger. The influence of which kids get in is stronger, isn't it?

Mr. Gehling: I'm not sure, and I don't want to dominate the conversation.

Mr. Shulman: How many more people are interested?

Mr. Gehling: I'm going to use 20 because it's easier for me to do the math. I actually was a math major, too. If there were 20 in '89 and five of those 20 got in, 25 percent got in. In '99 the same 20 apply but only 10 were targeted or designated as athletes, okay? The other 10 weren't designated but didn't get in. Five of the 10 designated as athletes got in. Now it appears that 50 percent of the people on the athletics list got in. So it appears that influence doubled from 25 to 50. When in reality, still the same five got in. Still five out of 20 got in. And influence hasn't changed. What's changed really is lines of communication between admissions and athletics. I do believe that's changed significantly. (Applause.)

Mr. Shulman: Who are you clapping for? I think it's just a question of how one defines communication. Say one of your coaches was a jerk. I'm playing a sport where one kid makes a difference. This kid, he's not very smart, but he's a good kid. If you give me this kid, we've been working together for five years, we've got a good system, just give me this one kid. And then that communication becomes what I think some people might think of as a negative influence. Used well, it can be great; used poorly, detrimental.

Chuck Gordon (Emory University): One of the other factors that you don't see is the absolute increase in early decision in early action programs. I know our list for early decision is much smaller and the percentage of those students who come is much greater because there's a different level of commitment to the institution. So just looking at the numbers from '89 to '99, we didn't have two rounds of really good decisions; we had one. There were only 75 applicants for decision, and now there's 500. So I think the early decision, early

application phenomenon, for better or worse—most of us think worse—really skewed the numbers.

I know our lists for '81 and '82 differ significantly from the percentages for regular decision. Those students are actually shopping a number of schools. So far, I think that one piece alone is going to skew on our campus—if you would have used our numbers—it would skew our percentages dramatically. Because we are recruiting 50 percent of our athletes in early decision 1 percent and 2, where 10 years ago it was 5 percent or less. So that level of commitment required to participate in early decision or early action skews anything you could look at statistically, in my opinion, from '89 to '99.

Mr. Shulman: Early decision is a very complicated force in all of this. But it's still part of who gets in and who doesn't.

John Ostrowski (Benedictine University, Illinois): One of the most disheartening slides is the slide that showed the underperformance of athletes in academic life. If there's one thing that you're looking at in the perceived culture of athletes, by the public and by faculty members, it's that athletes underperform academically. In trying to look back at that slide, was that substantially across the board in all levels of your study? Was it more perceived at the higher Division I levels than the at-large schools?

Then moving on from that, one of the neat things to see was the slide that showed that athletes make substantially more money when they're out. I'm trying to in my mind look at the mind of the student-athlete. It's more important for him to compete when he's in college as compared to being on the athletic field more so than competing in the classroom. Do you have any insights that you had in looking at some of the those factors.

Mr. Shulman: Good question. Actually, the academic underperformance is consistently found at Ivy League and liberal arts colleges, not at the big-time schools. At the big-time schools, if you're getting in with SAT scores that are 350 points lower than your peers, you're going to be predicted to finish at the very bottom of your class. So when you do, you perform poorly academically but you don't underperform what would have been predicted. It's those people who you saw with the red dots at this end of the graph who were very high scorers, who predicted to do well and then didn't do well—that when that effect is pervasive enough that you have a consistent and statistically significant academic underperformance. So that is now found among men and women at the large colleges, Division III schools in our study.

This is a transition to the second part of your question. Some people would say who cares? Graduation rates are very high. These people are not getting D's. If Larry Summers were here, we could have a discussion about grade inflation, which is a big issue. The actual number of grade difference between how these students are doing, the ones in the bottom third of the class and the ones in the top third is not enormous.

I think what's interesting, what's relevant about this are two things. One, it wasn't there before. So those of you, men who played sports in the '50s or '60s, you and your peers did not academically underperform. You didn't choose different majors from your peers. You played sports. You weren't as highly recruited. You were a lot more like your peers. You did as well academically. So all the benefits you've gotten in your life, perceived or real or whatever, from having played sports before you get a job, were there without having to pay that academic penalty.

Your time in the 40 was probably not as good and your vertical leap wasn't as high and you swam a hell of a lot slower—I'm sorry, you may not have—but you didn't pay those penalties. So it seems historically at least, and then I go to the '70s where the women performed academically better than your peers. So the women who played sports not only didn't pay an academic penalty, but were less likely to be at the bottom of the class. I don't think that the women who played sports in the '70s or early '80s, they may feel that they got a rotten deal in terms of facilities and coaching and traveling and all that, but I don't think that they felt like they didn't get a lot of the good lessons out of playing sports.

So all I'm trying to say is that while the academic penalty is not three whole grids or anything like that, it is there, it is real, and it doesn't have to be there. Now, then what happens in the marketplace, as you point out? Well, first of all, our earnings data are from those early years. So time will still play out. We'll see how the students of today do. But I think it's pretty safe to say that if you go into marketing or investment banking, you're going to make more money than somebody who goes to work in a liberal arts college. I think all of you know that as well as I do. Be it as a teacher or as a coach or as an administrator or a filmmaker or something like that.

So I think the patterns that we see in the culture will continue to make it so that kids with athletic talent who have very clear goals are probably going to earn more money. I think that's a fine thing, that's, in some cases, a great thing. But I think we as those who are charged with figuring out what our institution's goal is, what the goal of our educational process is, just have to figure out how much of a certain type of people with certain types of characteristics add and subtract to the campus. And whether the academic penalties or the differences are okay, not okay, whether they need to be there or don't need to be there.

Jeff Ward (Bowdoin College): One of the things in reading the book that's troubling in comparing your definition of a recruited athlete in '89 and then looking back at the early cohorts is that by using the definition of who is on the coach's list is significantly narrower than when you're looking at those classes from the '50s in terms of who's on the team. In fact, from an NCAA standpoint, it does not reflect who was actually recruited. So there's a number of people who all of us recruit who don't end up on those lists, for whatever the

institutional politics are. I think that may skew the numbers and whatnot.

I have two questions about under-performance. Would you address what you term as significance in under-performance? Because as I've looked at our data, when people may be under-performing, it turns out to be like sometimes one grade in one class a year. That when I talk to people about it in those terms rather than in percentile differentiation in a class, they think of that as not significant. Whereas when you, because the classes are so smushed in how they perform, that one can move several points in their position in the class with not very much difference in performance.

The last question I have is a discussion about culture in athletics. In interpreting the data, how many coaches and how many student-athletes did you talk to before interpreting the data?

Mr. Shulman: First question first. Statistically significant is a technical term of art. So the reason we have eight colleges is because of the liberal arts colleges in our study average 300, 400 kids on the campus. Athletes who are kids who win letters are 25, 30 percent of that. It wouldn't be enough data to draw any conclusions. Which is why, when you look at one campus, it's hard to find patterns that were statistically significant. So by aggregating the schools and standardizing across 100 percent rank in class, rather than dealing with the differences in letter grades at different places, that's when you end up with a question that you can ask if there is a coherent pattern here that's statistically significant.

We tossed every variable into these progression questions but the kitchen sink. We questioned to see how much this is attributable to race or ethnicity, because there are patterns of under-performance among some minority groups. How much is attributed to differences in socioeconomic status? Differences in major. Because, obviously, biology is tougher than some majors. So when we do find patterns, as you say, it's not the one student in the one class. There are all kinds of reasons—a kid's parents get sick or die while he's in college. He or she may stay or not do well in school. But when we identify something as a statistically significant pattern, it means that those patterns are there in regular enough ways that it certainly doesn't apply to everyone but it applies to the on-average student.

Does that help on that?

Mr. Ward: That's not the way I'm thinking of statistically significant. I think in the terms of if the average grade-point average for nonvarsity student-athletes is 3.1 and the average grade-point average for student-athletes is 3.0, at what point is that statistically significant and important?

Mr. Shulman: We'll refer to your colleague from Tufts. It's really a math question. It's when you run the equation and there's not enough cases but the variance is more than likely to be determined by chance. So we counted things statistically significant when less than a .05 difference than the same result could be produced by just

random probabilities.

Mr. Ward: A question that goes along with that, though, is you talk about the averages in the book. But there's very little talk about when particular institutions vary from those trends, and why that might be. Or why they might vary from year to year. I just wondered why you didn't address that in the book.

Mr. Shulman: We did test whether there was institutional-specific effects. In other words, we interacted each variable with the eight institutions to see if this wasn't true in some places or was completely effective at two or three of the eight institutions. That wasn't the case. I think we reported that in one of the footnotes. It was a coherent pattern across the institutions. Can I go to the second question?

Did we talk to enough coaches or kids who play sports or alumni involved in sports? The answer, I'm sure, is "no." I mean, what you see are empirical findings that I will claim are honest. People have said to me you said all this bad stuff about kids who play sports. Why don't you point out that they make more money? I said we do. We published that. We might have a spin on that. I am guilty as charged.

What you have are two foundation executives, one who actually knows something, Bill Bowen, who's been involved in higher education for 30 years, and one who's been involved for 20, who have a point of view from the foundation's point of view, from having talked to a lot of administrators. Dollars to doughnuts. I talk to more presidents than ADs. But I did try to talk to some ADs. I tried to vet it with some knowledgeable audiences and some didn't like it. We tried to respond to critiques of methodology or things that we received.

But in terms of do we have completely unbiased and a thoroughly enough developed understanding of every tail of every rabbit we're chasing, I'm sure we don't. But my goal, and the reason I like to engage in conversation about this, is I think what we did do—the thing I feel very good about—is that we checked this every way but Tuesday. The data are good. We didn't suppress. We didn't say, "oh, shoot, here's some really good news about this or that buried over here." The data are there. My goal is to keep having good conversations about how we should interpret things.

Sheila Wallace Kovalchik (Michigan Intercollegiate Athletic Association): I do not want to get into an academic discussion with my colleagues from Tufts, because I'll lose. Your research population consists of East Coast, academically elite, and by my standards somewhat financially expensive institutions. How do they relate to the rest of us from the farmlands and the West Coast?

Mr. Shulman: There's a little geographical diversity, but some people might consider the furthest extreme of the East Coast. I think that we do not have a representative sample here of just about anything except academically selective and, as you said, what I think were wealthy institutions. That having been said, I think the admissions issues, which we've been doing a lot of talking about, are really

just not as relevant as places where having an athletic program helps you fill your campus. It not only gets your name out there, but also attracts, like with anything having 12 literary magazines or whatever, kids to want to go to your campus and enjoy it. I think that's great. I think it's one of many functions of a good, fun sports program. I think some of the issues about academic selectivity, those opportunity costs are not as relevant.

I think the culture issues, I think that these go all the way through. I think that leadership and self-confidence and being goal- and team-oriented and all these things—I played sports, I love sports—are great things. But I think that one hears—and I don't have data on this—there are disciplinary problems among athletes. Obviously, that seems to be true at the big-time places. If it's true at Division III places, that isn't an issue about who gets in but about how it affects the campus culture.

Again, to make more money in life is a pretty coherent pattern among male athletes. Is that a good thing or is that a bad thing? If you're in an economics class and there's some part of the group there looking at this as a way of learning to learn about life and solve problems and one part says I don't really want to hear all that because I don't want to make more money, that's a very negative stereotype. Sorry. That's one way where a negative goal—or what I perceive to be a negative—back to Mr. Ward from Bowdoin's point—that's something I perceive to be negative. That's something that could be an attribute of an athletic culture at any institution. I think the pluses and minuses of having a coherent culture among kids who play sports, if there is a coherent culture, I think they also could learn about that and figure if that's what they want or not.

The finances, I think, will become a more general issue as finances become tighter. The last 10 years, it's items like astroturf, why can't we afford it? I think as those belts get tighter, the questions about what we're getting for these programs and what impact it's having I think are also going to be more of a dollars-and-cents issue across the spectrum.

Tom Weingartner (University of Chicago): I go back to the under-performance issue. That, I think, is very disconcerting, academic underperformance. It's hard to track your data around when you're comparing men to women and big schools to small schools and when you're only including a sample of one school. With the Division III institutions, what was the degree of under-performance? In other words, how badly did athletes under-perform based on projections where they should perform?

Secondly, do you have data breaking these data down by sport for Division III institutions?

Mr. Shulman: I'm sorry if the charts aren't clear. I find them painfully boring to read sometimes and complex in their labels. But I hope they are clear when men are being studied and women. These admissions charts that you see here and the admissions advantage

section of the book is the only one where the other schools in the study, not the Division III universities, we don't have data for all of them. So, and again, I apologize if the charts aren't clear.

In terms of the scale of difference, for Division III, for high-profile athletes for Division III colleges, the number for academic underperformance in the 1989 cohort was 11 points. So that's very similar to the gap we saw when I looked at the Ivy League athletes. So that's 11 points in rank in class. So that group might be predicted to finish in the 70th rank in class and finish in the 59th.

Mr. Weingartner: That's for football and men's and women's basketball?

Mr. Shulman: That's for football, men's basketball and ice hockey. I think for lower-profile sports, it's five points and for the women's sports, I think it was six points. So again, with all the graduating, like your colleague from Bowdoin said, we're talking about a very squished range here.

Mr. Weingartner: An analytical term. If I could just follow up. I know you have certain conclusions about job culture and whatnot. Why do you think this under-performance occurs in the way it does at Division III institutions?

Mr. Shulman: I think that, as I said earlier, I'm concerned that part of it is time—time spent traveling, time spent training. If you want to hear both sides of the argument, if you spend time on sports or in season, you do better in school because you manage your time better. But you also can see if you're spending a lot of time doing something nonacademically, it's going to take time away.

However, I think a good part of it's not time. We looked at people who have extracurricular activities who spend a lot of time, maybe not as much time, but we tried to get a group of pretty busy people. They're showing academic over-performance. Whether it was a perfect control group or not, I can't say. But I think it's at least indicative.

This is not our research. This is the research of two social psychologists—Nancy Cantor and Debbie Prentice—from two of the schools in our study. They're social psychologists and they do a much finer grain analysis about how people spend their time, what the norms are of athletes and other kids on campus. They found academic under-performance like we did, but they found disidentification. They found that the kids who didn't do well, who under-performed, felt okay about it in terms of the academic place.

They said some of the things that I think we were talking about today. I could have done better but I'm doing this other thing. I'm doing this other thing, which is great, which is fun, which got me into this place. I'll be in here. So clearly, the institution isn't saying don't care about playing lacrosse. The institution said to me play lacrosse. From what I hear from my former teammate from last year, J. P. Morgan says play lacrosse. So I'm getting lots of signals that say this is a fine thing to do. And I'm not saying that it's not worth it to spend

my time doing it.

One of the greater regrets—and I'll just say straight out, if there was a way of avoiding it, we would have done it—is that I often hear that the book and the research demonize the kids who play sports. By putting this out about under-performance, the kids who play sports are saying what's this? Do we not belong here? Are we not good kids? Are we not smart enough? The president says this is an important book. What's that saying about me? Do I not belong here?

If there was a way to avoid that, I would have loved it. We do not want to demonize the kids who play sports. All they're doing is acting extremely appropriately with the signals being sent, both by the schools that accept them, by the schools that think what they're doing is great, by the admissions officers, and then by the firms that hire them or whatever. So kids aren't doing anything wrong.

That collective societal set of signals is a big part of why there is this academic disidentification; i.e., you know, didn't do as well as I could have done but I did it because I had a great time and all that. I just counter that because I think it's relevant with that same study that looked at academic under-performance by minorities, by African-Americans. What we found in our earlier book, we found that African-Americans also under-performed academically. That study said when they looked at the findings about African-Americans, the African-Americans felt bad about not doing better. They said, I wish I'd taken better advantage of the opportunity I had. I could have done better. The reason was this or that.

I think that, and this is not any one person in this room's problem to solve. But again, it comes back to the signaling thing. I just think that it's an important signal that schools are sending that says, you don't want to settle for not doing as well as you can do academically, even if J. P. Morgan is saying it's okay. I think that's a tricky thing to say. That's asking schools to encounter a whole bunch of signals that the universe might be sending. But I think it's thinking about what degree of under-performance is okay and whether and maybe it is. I don't know.

Stacie Wentz (Salisbury University): I'd like to put a perspective on this that I don't think we've heard as of yet. I just want to address basically to the whole room, not specifically to you, as a business director, do you want a well-rounded student or do you just want a student with a high SAT score who does not participate in other activities?

From my experience as a high-school student and recently as student teaching at various high schools, I have found that the students who are athletes also participate in the leadership roles in their high schools. You've read your application. You list all your school activities. I think we find that when you do this, the students who are on your SGA, who are volunteering with the elementary students, going out into the schools and being leaders, are the ones who were also athletes.

I don't know if I was put on the list to get into college. But I know I was not just an athlete. I did everything to try to get myself to be a well-rounded person. And who knows? But I do also know that there's students who have perfect 1600s who don't get into Harvard. Why do they not? I'd just like to put that perspective onto the floor.

Mr. Shulman: I think there are a lot of great points there. The first thing I would say, this is back to my personal take on this. I think the last thing campuses want are to be filled with pencil-necked geeks. Maybe physicist professors just want people with perfect scores and they don't care if they can't tie their shoes. But I think that campuses filled with people like that would be a pretty drab place to be and you produce one kind of alumni.

I think the tougher issue for me, and as far as they overlap with other leadership and other activity, again, I think there were probably cases both ways and I would, I think we both would need to see what broader trends are to really know what the answer is, the answer to a certain group. But I think the toughest question is when it's a question of talent and focus. And when it's the kid who played field hockey for four years and is better academically prepared but not as talented as the kid who played four years and is all-state and that kid gets in. When it's that tried off, I think that's what's tougher. You're right. I'm 100 percent with you. I'm a big well-rounded-thing person. I think you can get out of balance in either direction. Thank you all very much.

John Schael (Washington University, Missouri): I just want to say that I certainly enjoyed reading the book *The Game of Life*. I thought it was very interesting and intriguing. Even if one reads it and didn't agree, it certainly is great food for thought for all of us to look at our own individual programs to see where we stand. I think the discussion that we had here today was most stimulating and probably one of the best that I've had the opportunity to experience. So thank you.

CHAMPS/LIFE SKILLS PROGRAM FORUM

Mr. Courtice: That's a great way to bring closure to this. Thanks, Jim Shulman. (Applause.)

We're going to move right ahead into the second part of the session and a practical approach to creating a positive athletics culture. It will be a discussion in the importance and value of a CHAMPS/Life Skills Program for Division III student-athletes. I'd like to introduce Tim Clark, program coordinator for Education Outreach at the NCAA. Tim works directly with the CHAMPS/Life Skills Program. Tim will provide a brief overview of the NCAA's program and introduce the panel of Division III campus constituents who have first-hand experience with the CHAMPS/Life Skills Program on their campuses.

Tim Clark (NCAA Staff): I work at the NCAA national office as program coordinator in education outreach. I'm one of two coordina-

tors for CHAMPS/Life Skills program, I find it very apropos to do this presentation following Mr. Shulman's presentation. We're here to present the CHAMPS/Life Skills Program and talk about the benefits to your student-athletes.

We've broken this up in a couple of ways. We have put together a panel of individuals. Two of them are Life Skills coordinators on Division III campuses—one is an athletic director, and another is a student-athlete who has a CHAMPS/Life Skills Program on her campus.

First of all, I'd like to give you a brief history. Where did this come from? As many of you may know, CHAMPS stands for Challenging Athletes' Minds for Personal Success. This came from the Division I-A athletic directors association. They started this program for their athletes and have had a lot of success with it. However, in 1994, the NCAA felt that this program should be applied to all student-athletes across all divisions. So in turn, the education services group adopted this program and made it applicable to all divisions. The group made it into a model that every institution can take and do some effective programming for their student-athletes on their campus.

I'll give you some quick numbers.

Currently, we have over 400 institutions across the divisions that have the CHAMPS/Life Skills Program. There are approximately 102 Division III institutions that have the program on their campuses. Every year, we send out word to member institutions that do not have the program and invite them to apply and adopt the program on their campus. This past year, we had the biggest increase from membership from Division III institutions that we've ever had. I think that says a lot about what's happening on our campuses.

I want to briefly go through the five commitments that this program is based upon. The speakers on our panel are going to talk more in depth about these commitments as well as the things going on at our campuses. However, to give you a brief overview of how this is done, I want to run through them. One thing I would like you to remember is that when the program was developed, it was developed with the thought that all institutions in some way are different. Everyone has different issues to a certain degree, and we did not want to develop a program that was so rigid and so structured that it would only apply to certain types of institutions. You're going to find that the commitment years that I present to you are very broad. They make sure they look at different topics that you should be doing on your campus to assist your student-athletes.

First and foremost is a commitment to academic excellence. Obviously, this is self-explanatory. On a Division III campus, our student-athletes are definitely committed to their academic performance. We try to provide you with resources to assist those student-athletes to achieve their academic goals from a student-athletes perspective.

Second—commitment to athletic excellence. Again, it's very self-

explanatory. What things can we do to provide them the tools, in addition to what they're getting from their coaches, to assist them as they go on? We want to make sure they have all the different tools, whether it's dealing with nutritional issues or just physical issues. We want to provide everything they need in the course of their athletic careers so they can get better in that area.

Third—personal development. Again, this really branches out to all different things and encourages looking at emotional personal growth and all the decision-making type skills that they need. This falls in line with some of the things that we're doing with the NCAA Foundation leadership conference and upcoming regional leadership conferences.

Next is a commitment to service. Commitment to service is community service type projects, getting student-athletes involved on their campus as well as in their community to become mentors, to become agents so they can go out and assist other young, budding collegiate student-athletes and get them to recognize the successes and all the different things that it takes to become a collegiate student-athlete.

Last is a commitment to career development. This area includes anything and everything possible to assist a career services office in recognizing the unique aspects about a student-athlete. What are some of the things that student-athletes learn or the things that they're involved with and the type of career path that they may choose?

These are the five commitment areas. I'd like to now go to our panelists. We're going to start with our first panelist—Ms. Jean Conway. Jean is the academic and Life Skills coordinator at State University of New York, Oswego. Jean also serves on the CHAMPS/Life Skills Program advisory board. Jean.

Jean Conway (State University College at Oswego): I have about five minutes to talk about my life as a Division III CHAMPS/Life Skills coordinator. I'd like to tell you about the evolution of our program and the value of CHAMPS/Life Skills to our students, staff and college.

With the support of my athletic director, Dr. Sandra Moore, and the intercollegiate athletic board, I am very fortunate to serve full time as Oswego's CHAMPS/Life Skills coordinator. I've been doing this for several years now, five as a member institution of the CHAMPS/Life Skills program. Oswego has approximately 400 student-athletes participating in 23 varsity sports.

I began as a graduate assistant providing counseling support for student-athletes. I work with student-athletes on academic and personal issues. I have learned a great deal during this time about their needs as students, athletes and individuals. Managing all of these aspects of their lives and doing well were important but at times difficult to achieve, even for the most conscientious. I learned that having support, having time for them to access support, or simply learn-

ing how to access, was fundamental to their sense of belonging and overall success.

In general, athletes are taught to be very strong, self-reliant and composed. Asking for help at times can be difficult. This full-time program was born in 1995 out of the need to support our athletes' academic success. Its initial focus was on academic advisement and academic monitoring. About a year into the process we received an application from the NCAA inviting us to consider the CHAMPS/Life Skills program. I was very aware of the program. I had served as an intern at Syracuse University during the pilot year of the NCAA CHAMPS/Life Skills program. I knew about student development emphasis. So in consultation with our athletic director, we completed the application and we were subsequently accepted into this program.

I then attended a five-day orientation program in Kansas City. I learned about the program history, its purpose, the commitment areas that Tim just focused on, how to get a program started, how to get funding, ways to adapt it to your population and many other subjects. But I never doubted for a moment its potential at Oswego. It seemed to be a perfect fit with Division III philosophy, placing the highest priority on the overall quality of the educational experience and successful completion of the students' academic programs. It supported and hopefully would help to facilitate our campus mission and subsequent strategic plan.

One goal in particular addresses strengthening the development of a diverse learning community and focused on facilitating the academic and personal development of each student. Pragmatically, it would provide us with a structure, resources that we would need and a connecting point or some common ground with student affairs on our campus. So, our OASISS Program was born. It is Oswego Athletes Striving to Incorporate Skills for Success. Initially, I had no budget and no staff. The budget part wasn't an immediate problem. What I really needed was a buy-in from our coaches and student-athletes on campus to move this initiative ahead.

So not unlike many other CHAMPS/Life Skills member institutions, I spent the first weeks pulling together an advisory group from our department around campus. In fact, we spent the first year planning. This included our coaching staff, student-athletes, faculty and professional staff on our campus. We really focused on program concept and how this might be useful to our student-athletes, our teams and our coaches. We were also encouraged by the NCAA to share all program resources with our campus. The interest was immediate and so was the willingness to help.

After that our student-athletes completed an assessment that provided feedback on Life Skills areas that they felt were important in their lives. The results really confirmed some of my initial assumptions in conversations with our students. Managing time, managing stress, setting goals, career development and dealing with loss were

at the top of their lists. Our coaches also completed an assessment that asked what they were currently doing in their programs to support their students' well being. This really helped to initially provide us with some program direction.

During this time, I also met with many campus constituent groups to learn about the support and opportunities currently being provided to students at Oswego and how we could work together to help our student-athletes to access services and opportunities that were needed and desired. For example, tutoring or special study review groups. Regardless of division, I think probably all of us are well aware that our student-athletes spend a great deal of time preparing and competing. Many of our students, including our student-athletes, also work part-time jobs to help support their education. Still others are contributing to campus life in many other ways outside of the classroom and athletic venues.

Our program grew pretty consistently over the years and is very much a collaborative effort between athletics, student affairs and academic affairs. We've become very much an integral part of the first-year experience for students at Oswego with our CHAMPS class, which is a three-credit, first-year class for our student-athletes and our first-year advisement program.

I do have a budget now, so we are also able to initiate some other programming. We again have our CHAMPS class. I do a welcome at the beginning of the year, which is a big barbecue for our athletes. We run a student-athlete orientation program. We also have a fall speakers program, with the help of the NCAA speakers grant. I have a student-athlete mentor program and we provide two academic credits a semester for our upperclassmen to work with our first-year students, and it is an academic course. We also run a career program with the alumni office and our office of career services. This coming spring will be our first-ever academic recognition celebration in coordination with National Student-Athlete Day.

I also serve on several campus-wide committees that involve student development and success. And now I have a part-time assistant and a graduate assist who work with me. Prior to CHAMPS/Life Skills, our relationship with our campus was not strong. There was a lack of awareness about athletics in general and the lives of our student-athletes specifically. We have begun to connect the sidewalks and bridge the gaps. Our message is that we are interested in the success of our students, and the feedback is much more positive and our students are benefitting.

To those who might question whether we are providing services that treat athletes differently or more favorably than the rest of the student body, I would say no. Our campus currently provides several first-year programs for all students, as well as other support services and opportunities for many special interest groups on our campus. Our student-athletes, like other populations, face some challenges unique to their roles.

I have to say that the NCAA provides terrific support through education outreach. As coordinators, we are continually being updated and trained in new Life Skills areas. It has also allowed for the opportunity for all of us to work with many other CHAMPS/Life Skills institutions nationally. As I stated a minute ago, there are several grant opportunities for money to help our programs and several leadership opportunities for our student-athletes, including the NCAA Foundation's Leadership Conference.

I am fortunate to be able to devote my full attention to this initiative but wholeheartedly believe that CHAMPS/Life Skills can exist in a part-time format. There is no one prescribed fit; it is highly adaptable. I'd like to thank the NCAA and the education outreach staff for the opportunity to talk about CHAMPS/Life Skills and the benefits of this program. I'm going to turn the microphone over now to Dr. Sandra Moore, my athletic director at Oswego, and certainly my greatest advocate. Thank you. (Applause.)

Sandra Moore (State University College at Oswego): Jean has given you an overview of our CHAMPS/Life Skills program. I would like to give you a brief history of how I feel I've gotten to this point and why I so wholeheartedly support her involvement in the program and our involvement in the program.

In one of my first years as the athletic director at Oswego, we accepted a marginal student-athlete who happened to be an outstanding soccer player. He was the high scorer that fall and led our team to our first postseason appearance in a number of years. In November of that year, we finished second in the ECAC championship and in December he had failed out of school. This served as a wake-up call to me, and I took the stand that if we were going to accept at-risk student-athletes, then we had an obligation to provide them with the services that they needed to have to be successful.

So we began our academic support program, modestly at first, with mandatory study hall for our incoming first-year student-athletes and the present student-athletes who were on academic warning. We were able to get a graduate assistant from the psychological service department. I believe Jean was our second graduate assistant from that program. We began to branch out to do academic monitoring, advising undeclared student-athletes and personal counseling. That position has grown into Jean's position today, which is full-time.

Throughout the development of our program, we remain cognizant of our Division III status and philosophy. We've tried to make the program an integral part of the campus overall educational process. Our summer orientation program is held in conjunction with colleges. We do not tutor the student-athletes. We try to educate them to take advantage of the resources that are available to them on campus. We encourage our athletes to work closely with their professors and to seek out their academic advisors. Jean and her staff work closely with the athletes and professors in monitoring midterm

grades and academic progress.

Our transition into the CHAMPS/Life Skills program was an easy one. While the program was developed as an initiative of the NCAA Foundation and Division I athletic directors, I believe that the program's goals and mission are intrinsic in the Division III philosophy. Division III institutions have always prided themselves in providing participation opportunities for student-athletes in a program that was an integral part of the educational program of their campuses.

A stated goal of the CHAMPS/Life Skills program is to support student personal development and enhance the quality of the student-athlete experience within the university setting. I believe that involvement in the program gets student-athletes involved in active, responsible decision-making in their academic, athletic and personal lives. It also encourages and provides opportunities for the student-athletes to develop leadership skills and to become active in service to their campus and to their community.

In terms of cost, I think we're fortunate at Oswego. We have our athletic program primarily funded by an athletic fee that's assessed to all of our undergraduate students. The budget is overseen by the intercollegiate athletic board, which is made up primarily of faculty members. It's not a very difficult task to convince faculty to invest resources in the overall academic success of the student-athletes. In fact, it was a lot easier for me to get a budget for Jean than it was to get a copy machine for the sports information office.

Jean's budget presently is approximately \$14,000, which includes money for orientation programs, guest speakers, our opening barbecue at which all of the student-athletes and the coaches get their introduction to the CHAMPS/Life Skills Programs and their OASISS T-shirts. It also includes money for the student-athlete mentor program, the reception that we have at the end of the year, and includes money for Jean to attend the CHAMPS/Life Skills education conference. I try to treat her budget as I do all of our sports program budgets and include it in my overall budget.

When I think of costs, I just have to keep reminding myself of the soccer player who we had a number of years ago and know that he would be a lot better off if he had an Oswego degree today than he was back in that fall when he was traveling by bus in his new warm-ups to the championship soccer game. Thank you. (Applause.)

Tim Clark (NCAA Staff): Thank you. Next on our panel is Mike Lindberg. Mike is the associate athletic director and Life Skills coordinator at Ithaca College. Mike also serves on our CHAMPS/Life Skills program advisory board. Mike.

Mike Lindberg (Ithaca College): Thanks, Tim. I think it's great to follow Sandy and Jean and how their program has evolved over the years. I've been asked to describe for you where we are right now since we're at the early stages of the development of our Life Skills program. I certainly wouldn't dream of using this forum as a way of

advocating to my boss the need for more funding, more staff, more resources; I wouldn't really think of doing that. (Laughter.)

But my role here today is to talk to you about how to coordinate your Life Skills program and at the same time manage your full-time role in compliance event scheduling, facility scheduling, events management, inventory, fund-raising, alumni, picking up your boss' dry cleaning and vacuuming out her car. With that, I think it's great that we're able to follow Dr. Shulman's presentation on his book *The Game of Life*. It's a great segue to discuss how we, as Mr. Shulman and Mr. Bowen wrote, shape our collective interpretation on what the game itself is all about, what the rules are and how we as a society define winning and losing.

Describing our Life Skills program, however, reminds me of the philosophy test I had to take when I was an undergraduate at LeMoyne where the Jesuits would ask us to define the universe, give two examples, and use both sides of the paper, if necessary. The point is your Life Skills program can be as complex or as simple as you want. Whatever which way works for you. You just simply need to decide and commit to it.

Our situation at Ithaca College is not unlike many other schools in Division III. We have 900 student-athletes, which is roughly 15 percent of our student population. We compete on 25 varsity and four subvarsity athletic teams. The athletic director and I, as the only two exempt administrators on staff, have to wear many hats during the course of a day. So in order for our CHAMPS/Life Skills program to be successful, we're going to need to identify stakeholders and most likely twist a few arms.

Stephen Covey, the author of *Seven Habits of Highly Effective People*, wrote: "Begin with the end in mind." Four years ago when I attended the 2 1/2-day orientation program in Kansas City, I began with Covey's second habit in mind but soon found myself asking many more questions than there were quick and ready answers. I tended to put the cart before the horse with questions like how much will it cost? What resources do we need? How much time will it take? What are the benefits of the program? Will our coaching staff support the program? Will our student-athletes attend the program? Am I actually expected to do all this stuff by myself?

Essentially, I came back to the same fundamental question, however. Do we really need CHAMPS/Life Skills on our Division III campus? Don't student-athletes already have access to the same support services and programs that are available to nonstudent-athletes? Besides, isn't this program geared more towards the needs of Division I and Division II student-athletes?

I believe Drs. Shulman and Bowen actually gave us the best reason for incorporating Life Skills in our athletic program, that is to ensure that the intensification of athletics is not being pulled away from our respective institutional mission statements. We maintain, like all of you, that Division III intercollegiate athletics offers our

student-athletes with a very dynamic and rich environment from which to learn, grow, and develop; that there are student-athletes interested in utilizing the programs and services available to all students but need them in a different way; and that our student-athletes, like those at the Division I and II level, need Life Skills programming to assimilate their participation in athletics as a critical component of their overall education.

To assume that the five commitments of Life Skills is relevant to only scholarship athletes would be to ignore the needs of a very large campus population. To that end, we created LEADS, which stands for Leadership Education for Athletes Determined to Succeed. It is extremely important having a vision for a program; but having the personnel, money, time, resources and support is something else all together.

A sports psychologist once told me that you should focus on your strength when confronting a challenging situation. One of the strengths of working on a Division III college campus is the very nature of teaching and collegiality. Collegiality implies that there are people, faculty, staff and students on our campus who want to help for pure, altruistic reasons and don't expect tickets to a ball game in return.

With limited time to spend, I opted to look within the strengths of our institution and apply the mantra of problem solving for all institutions of higher education—I started a committee. Since team building is something we do in athletics, we assembled a team of willing, able and talented members of the student affairs staff and faculty, who, in collaboration with representatives of our coaching staff student-athlete advisory council, were charged with designing our Life Skills program.

The Life Skills advisory board met twice per semester to discuss the needs of our interested student-athletes, look for ways to adjust existing programs and services to meet their special needs, and create new avenues for enhancing the student-athlete experience within the college setting. My job suddenly became a whole lot easier and the programs became a whole lot more creative and targeted. I think Covey calls that synergy.

To paraphrase my boss, now you got all these great people and these great programming ideas. Just how do you expect to pay for it? I learned that nothing will stop a freight train of ideas quicker than that budget question. Our athletic department does not have a Life Skills budget dedicated to programming. But in Division III, we're used to doing more with less or anything at all. Besides, if we do everything I've asked for, there'd be no reason for collaboration. All the departments represented on our Life Skills advisory board have programming money and needed a good idea and students to benefit. So we collaborated our strengths. I had the interested students. Together, we hatched the ideas and they had the money. Again, the magic of synergy.

Since creating the advisory board, much of my time coordinating our Life Skills program is spent playing match-maker, identifying resources and matching it with the needs of our student-athletes. While prospecting for the funding and the ideas and the support, I found the NCAA education outreach staff to be an extraordinary resource. The lists that are created for Life Skills coordinators; the annual continuing education conference and student leadership conference; the initiative grants for student-athlete welfare, diversity, alcohol and drug education have enabled us to create a comprehensive program benefitting not only our student-athletes in the athletic department, but the entire college community.

CHAMPS/Life Skills is not a cookie cutter program. Like any construction project, we began with a drawing provided by education outreach. But as we started to build, we customized our program to represent who we are and who we are for. Over the past four years, we have been able to turn some of the bigger barriers to our programs into assets and stockholders. Coaches and student-athletes who were originally skeptical and concerned about the burden this program might create are now asking for more. Where we once had to find student-athletes to nominate for leadership positions, we are now selecting from a pool of interested student-athletes. What was once perceived to be a program for student-athletes only is now received by many other areas on campus, benefitting athletes and nonathletes alike.

The key to initiating a Life Skills program on campus is to be focused with purpose, identify who is committed, rather than who should be committed, and most importantly allow yourself to be imaginative. As Bill Bradley said, when you have imagination, you can be creative; and when you're creative, you can change the way people do things. With that, I'll turn the microphone over to Stacie Wentz, who will be talking about the Life Skills program and how it can benefit the Division III student-athlete. (Applause.)

Stacie Wentz (Salisbury University, Student-Athlete Advisory Committee): Hello. Does CHAMPS/Life Skills benefit the Division III student-athlete or is it a program just for the Division I or II student-athlete? CHAMPS/Life Skills programming benefits all student-athletes, no matter what division they compete. Student-athletes of Division III institutions sometimes face more challenges in that they are two-sport or even three-sport athletes, such as myself.

As we all know, athletics is an integral part of campus society, and the athlete is an integral part of the student body. In order for the student-athlete to be an equally integral member of the campus society, he or she must be able to handle the stresses and time constraints of preparing for competition while also preparing for academic success. The CHAMPS/Life Skills program supports efforts of every student-athlete for intellectual development and graduation. It prepares them for life during the undergraduate years and for life after sports.

Division III student-athletes have been participating in athletics since they were young, just as Division I and II athletes have done. This program teaches us to take the skills we've learned on the field, court, or track and transfer them into skills we will use in our future careers. CHAMPS/Life Skills uses athletics as a preparation for success in life. Other benefits of CHAMPS/Life Skills programming include permitting respect for diversity, assisting athletes in building positive self-esteem, and encouraging the development of leadership skills.

I recently spoke with a friend, who went to a small Division III liberal arts college in Massachusetts, about the subject of this forum and asked him what he thought was most beneficial about his CHAMPS/Life Skills experience. He said that he remembered his lecture in learning about self-motivation. For students, the key to success in college is self-motivation. We no longer have our parents making sure we go to class and study. They no longer hover over us to make sure we put in those extra training miles on an all-competition weekend or go to 7 a.m. morning treatments in the training room to get rid of our nagging injuries.

CHAMPS/Life Skills promotes ownership of student-athletes of their academic, athletic, personal and social responsibilities. At Division III institutions, student-athletes are responsible for their own success, because we do not have the luxury of having academic coordinators or athletic academic tutors on our campuses as our counterparts in Divisions I and II. We are responsible for finding that help we need ourselves.

At Salisbury University, student-athletes participate in CHAMPS/Life Skills, freshman orientation, coordinated in collaboration with our new student experiences office. Freshman student-athletes have the option to participate in a summer orientation program or a classroom orientation program once they arrive on campus in the fall. It is during these orientation programs that students learn about the various campus offices they can go to for help. The student-athletes learn that assistance is available if they are self-motivated to seek that help. A team of coaches, athletic administrators and current student-athletes, who serve as student facilitators, teach the orientation class. Freshman student-athletes benefit most by having the current student-athletes available to provide guidance as to how to manage the constraints of being a student and being an athlete at the same time.

Now, I could go on and on about the benefits of CHAMPS/Life Skills programming and what it provides to Division III student-athletes. But I think you pretty much have gotten the point. All student-athletes in Divisions I and II participate in CHAMPS/Life Skills programming. So I ask you one final question. Why shouldn't Division III student-athletes have the opportunity to participate in this wonderful program? Challenging an athlete's mind for personal success should be a primary objective for all Division III athletic depart-

ments. I strongly urge all of you who do not currently have CHAMPS/Life Skills programming to come aboard. Your student-athletes will be grateful. (Applause.)

Tim Clark (NCAA Staff): Before we go to questions, several of our speakers gave information to you about the benefits of the program. I just briefly want to go over them once again. As you can see from our list, when a school comes on board with the program, they are required to send a representative to an orientation session. Annually that happens every February. It happens before our continuing education conference for all of our coordinators. This is a three-day commitment. This year, for example, this event is happening in Orlando, Florida. It rotates every year.

Next is instructional notebooks. Presently, we send out about 12 binders. Sometimes we get calls back from coordinators saying I've got all this information. Where am I going to put it? My office is not that big. But we try to provide as much information as possible so they can really get their program started and go from there.

Resource materials. Continually we are updating materials and sending it out to our coordinators so they have as fresh a view on different topics and how to present it to their student-athletes and how to deal with certain issues.

The annual continuing education conference. Once again, that happens immediately following orientation and is open to all coordinators.

Both Jean and Mike as well as Stacie referred to the NCAA Foundation leadership conference. This is something that I know we have placed a lot of pride in. Presently, the pool of applicants come from strictly CHAMPS/Life Skills program institutions. This is something in which the student-athletes have benefitted tremendously from. Of course, there's the NCAA Division III regional leadership conferences. The first one will be next November. It has really spawned out of the success of the NCAA Foundation Leadership Conference.

Lastly, of course, you're going to receive all the support necessary from our educational outreach staff. So with that said, if anyone has any questions for our panelists, we would love to take them.

Marvin Zuidema (Calvin College): I think I'll address it to Mike because he alluded to it. One of the things that always comes with the nonathlete and the athlete being treated alike is the question about how much of this programming can be done with the nonathlete as well so that there can be some combination of that on campus and this would broaden the outreach of that to all of our students on campus.

Mike Lindberg (Ithaca College): Good question. Actually, we just started a program this year with one of the NCAA initiative grants directed to first-year student-athletes. In talking with the director of our counseling center and other members of our leadership advisory board, our orientation program and first-year programs

director, we found that a lot of first-year students at Ithaca will come here thinking they have an identity as "I'm a student-athlete." Then they try out for their teams and then all of a sudden they're cut and their identity that they came to Ithaca with as student-athlete is now who am I? I'm not sure who I am.

Our life-skills program, it's called Boundaries Are Involved—everything is our nickname—tries to get our student-athletes working together with our nonstudent-athletes towards making a connection on the campus, especially in the first year. I guess that's one way to try to answer your question. That's how we try to get the nonathletes and the athletes to benefit together from the programming.

Jean Conway (State University College at Oswego): I think I can also address the same question. We do it in several ways. At the beginning of the year we have a speakers program in the fall semester where we will open that up to our entire campus. Also, through our student-athlete mentor program, we are part of Oswego's peer education network. So our student-athletes are part of this peer education network, and they are on the advisory board of OPEN—Oswego Peer Education Network—where they collaborate with other peer ed groups on our campus for programming and service kinds of opportunities.

I also run a Kids Day Out/Kids Night Out program, which requires quite a few volunteers to run the program. It has become a campus-wide effort and service. So we have several residence halls on our campus that have to fulfill community service. So in addition to our athletes, we're also bringing nonathletes into this program too. So I think there's several ways.

Mr. Zuidema: Is the foundation and leadership acceptable to that kind of thing if you put together a combination type of program?

Ms. Conway: I'm not sure I understand what you're saying.

Mr. Zuidema: What I'm trying to get at is I'd like to see it broadened out on campus to other folks. Because it's sponsored by a certain athlete type of foundation, the questions is can we broaden it out?

Ms. Conway: Absolutely. I don't see any reason why you can't. I think from day one I was encouraged by the NCAA to share materials and share myself with the campus. Not only am I sitting on committees on our campus, but we bring in faculty and staff from outside of athletics to be part of our committees to help develop some of these programs. I think it can be very much a collaborative effort with our students and with our faculty and staff.

Mr. Lindberg: I spent the first 15 years of my professional career working in campus activities, leadership development and orientation. Then four years ago, I came over to athletics. I found a whole program at Ithaca geared towards leadership development towards those students who wanted to be involved in student government, Greek life, programming, things of that nature. They had the workshops, and they had the programs.

When I came over to the athletics side, it was, hey, we could use

some of that, too, but we're not sure where to get started. So we just simply connected the two, let's connect the dots. As a result, we're able to share the resources that have been existent primarily in the campus activities area or the orientation area or office of multicultural affairs. They are now being provided to our student-athletes. The materials and the information and the resources that we have in athletics through the NCAA are now benefitting the nonstudent-athletes in those other areas as well.

Ms. Moore: We had an interesting situation on campus when we developed our CHAMPS/Life Skills class. The class itself had to go through the faculty governance process. When we made our presentation for acceptance at the faculty assembly, that's exactly what happened. They asked why we couldn't do this all over campus? I think that really helped to bolster some of our general studies courses on campus. They were using our class as a model.

Larry James (Richard Stockton College of New Jersey): Other than the goodwill that it sounds like you got from doing the program, on many of our campuses that are outcome orientated, how were you able to quantify the results of the outcome? Better retention? How do you go about doing that?

Ms. Conway: That's really a good question. What they did last year, I think it came out of student affairs, is they actually took the first-year classes, this included our CHAMPS course as well as some of the other first-year classes on the campus just to take a look at retention. I'm not sure anything significant came from this one look at it. But it did tell us that we weren't retaining our students either.

With every function that we have, we evaluate it. We get our student-athlete input and we get our coaches' input in terms of what they liked about it, what they didn't like about it. That goes into a report. We're just beginning to track our student-athletes, especially those who have been involved in the CHAMPS class, which is a three credit class. What we really need to do is take a look at the last three years to see what's happened to those students. That would be number one.

Number two, I work very closely with students who are on academic warning or have been disqualified from the college and reinstated in an academic monitoring process. We had a very successful semester this semester. But again, that's another program where we need to take a longer-range look to see what happens to these students. Are we seeing them again after they're through with the monitoring program? Typically, we're not. I can tell you anecdotally we're not. But I think we need to measure that. So you're absolutely right. I think that's the direction we're heading in right now.

Mr. Clark: Do we have any other questions? I'd like to wrap this up very quickly. I want to thank our panelists for being a part of this program. (Applause.) We have placed on each table an overview that Jean has very graciously put together of her CHAMPS/Life Skills program at SUNY College at Oswego. Also, there is a CHAMPS/Life

Skills program brochure on the table. You're welcome to take those. If you have any questions, please contact the NCAA education outreach staff. Thank you for this time.

Mr. Courtice: Thank you, Tim, and thank you, members of the panel. A couple of quick announcements. You probably all are well aware that the Convention formally opens at 4:30 with the general business session. It is in the ballroom over at the convention center. Because of the heightened security measures at this year's Convention, you need your badge to be able to get in. Also, the Honors Dinner begins at 7:30 tonight. It's sold out—or close. They will be asking for tickets as you go in the door. Thank you all very much. See you at 4:30.

[The Division III Forum was adjourned at 4 p.m.]

■ Division III Business Session

Monday Morning, January 14, 2002

The Division III Business Session was called to order at 8 a.m., with Presidents Council Chair Tom Courtice presiding.

OPENING REMARKS

Mr. Courtice: Good morning, everyone, and welcome to today's Division III Business Session. My name is Tom Courtice. I am president at Ohio Wesleyan University, but for today I am the Division III chair of the Presidents Council, and I will be chairing today's business session.

Joining me on the dais this morning are Joy Reign, director of athletics at Rowan University and chair of the Division III Management Council; Lee Pelton, president of Willamette University; and Oscar Page, president of Austin College and vice-chair of the Management Council. Standing behind me is Dan Dutcher, Division III chief of staff; Bridget Belgiovine, who serves as Division III assistant chief of staff; Georgana Taggart, coordinator of paralegal studies and faculty athletics representative at the College of Mount St. Joseph, who will serve today as our parliamentarian—I hope she won't be needed; Chris Martin, who is a membership services representative at the national office and our Division III legislative liaison; and Brad Hostetter, who also is a membership services representative. Chris and Brad will serve as our interpretative experts during our discussion of proposed legislation, which will occur later today.

Also joining us is a court reporter. Her name is Annisa Justice, who was a former NCAA staff member. She will create an accurate record of this meeting.

Our first order of business will be to adopt the Convention Notice and the Convention Program. That Notice is in the aqua-colored book that you received in November. The Convention Program is in the smaller pamphlet that you received at the time of registration. We are voting to adopt the Convention Notice and the Program. We will be voting on the proposals in the order that they appear in these publications. If you want to reorder any proposals, this is the time to do so.

Donna Ledwin (New Jersey Athletic Conference): Is it appropriate at this time to request items from the noncontroversial legislative package to be removed?

Mr. Courtice: Not quite yet. We're going to deal with this reordering and then we'll move to accepting and we'll take any of the noncontroversial items out. Don't go too far from the mike.

Not hearing any motion to reorder, we will move forward. The

motion for adopting the Notice and the Program does in fact include adopting two legislative appendices that are found in the Convention Notice. One is the grouping of noncontroversial amendments in Appendix D, which starts on Page 125. The second legislative grouping is in Appendix F and includes modifications based on intent. It starts on Page 157. All of these amendments have already been approved by the Management Council and the Presidents Council and published in The NCAA News. We will not discuss any of them unless you ask to do so.

We will however first vote. We'll take a motion and vote to accept the rest of the package. Then we'll go back and discuss the individual proposals as they've been identified for separate consideration. This is as a courtesy to the membership that we do this. We will review each proposal that you ask to be removed or broken out. When we do that, they are debatable and they would require a majority vote. If the proposals that are pulled out are not approved after discussion, they will automatically go back to the Management Council. So by asking to have them come out and be discussed, the motivation would be to not have them approved.

I will first ask for a motion from the floor to adopt the printed Notice and the Program for the business session so that we may proceed with the work. Is there a motion? It's been moved and seconded. Is there a second? I hear a second.

Are there any requests to consider any of the proposals separately or are there any other motions?

Ms. Ledwin: I would move for the removal of Proposal NC-4 from the noncontroversial legislation package.

Mr. Courtice: Actually, all you need to do is request it. It doesn't need a motion and we'll do that as a courtesy. So NC-4 will be pulled out of the nonlegislative package.

Arleigh Dodson (Northwest Conference): I object to the incorporation of NC-6.

Mr. Courtice: Thank you, Arleigh. There are two items, NC-4 and NC-6, that will be pulled out of the noncontroversial legislation and will be voted on in a moment separately. Are there any others?

Let's vote then on accepting the rest of the Notice and the Program first. If you are in favor of accepting the rest of the Program as printed, all in favor will you please raise your paddles? Opposed? It's a vote.

Now we'll go back to those items and we'll discuss them separately. We will ask for votes on both of these after a brief discussion. If you vote in favor, there will not be another motion because the larger motion to accept this body of legislation has already been made. If on this next vote you vote in favor, it will be folded into the noncontroversial legislation and approved. If you vote against, it will be sent back to the Management Council.

Ms. Ledwin: I don't have a lot to say except that by majority vote of our conference we just simply did not believe that this was non-

controversial legislation and should not have been included in the noncontroversial legislative package.

Suzanne Coffey (Bates College): On behalf of the Division III Interpretations and Legislation Committee, I urge the membership to include this proposal in the package of noncontroversial proposals adopted by the Management Council.

This proposal will eliminate legislation that permits only schools and conferences that sponsor football to vote on proposals that impact the sport of football, such as Proposal Nos. 53, 54, 54-1 and 55 to be voted on later this afternoon.

Football is the only sport that has this unique provision. Schools that do not sponsor lacrosse can still vote on proposals related to the sport of lacrosse. In this light, football is treated differently than all other Division III sports. This legislation is a carry-over from the old NCAA structure that was in place prior to federation in 1997 and was a concession to the influence of Divisions I-A and those football powers. The role football plays in Division III differs significantly.

Dennis Collins (North Coast Athletic Conference): This proposal eliminates the restrictive right of football-only universities and conferences to vote on football issues. This legislation will allow all Division III members, whether they sponsor football or not, to vote on football issues. Currently, the privilege to vote by football-only members is one of a dozen restrictive voting privileges in Division III.

As one example, those institutions that sponsor women's sports only cannot vote on men's sports and vice versa. What concerns our 10 football-playing members is that none of the other restrictive voting privileges are included along with the football voting issue. We don't understand why football is being singled out for elimination. We feel these issues need further study by the Legislative Committee, and we would enjoy the opportunity to discuss this following that review and study. Thank you.

Mr. Courtice: Thank you, Dennis. If you agree with the position that Dennis has just voiced, you would be voting against this and you'd send it back to the Management Council.

Ms. Ledwin: I would just like to add one comment to what was stated by Suzanne Coffey. If you do indeed believe that football should not be treated differently than other sports, then we hope that you will take that into consideration when we get to Proposal No. 54.

Mr. Courtice: Are you ready to vote? Voting in favor will fold this into the noncontroversial legislation and NC-4 will be approved. If you vote against, you're sending it back to the Management Council. All those in favor, raise your paddles. All those opposed? It is a vote in favor.

Mr. Dodson: I would like NC-6 returned to the committee. I'm objecting on two grounds. One is that it is controversial. The second is on necessity in order for it to be incorporated in this fashion. It must be both necessary and noncontroversial.

So on the two pieces, it is not controversial first because of proce-

dural matters. I'm going to address the procedure side first. To begin that, if we're going to talk about it, we're looking at NC-6 on the blue pages, Page 131. The first thing I want to do is be certain that you all understand that in fact we are dealing with Item 12.02.5, student-athlete. The reason for that is the title is wrong. It has "enrolled student-athlete." The intent statement is wrong. It has "enrolled student-athlete." The statement of 12.5 is not a quote. They insert the word enroll. So if you just remove "enrolled," "enrolled," "enrolled," and we understand in fact we are talking about Item 12.02.5.

The next thing is to recognize that all of the italicized words are existing 12.02.5. All of the bold-faced words in this proposal are existing 13.02.5. So the bold words do exist as 13.02.5 on Page 70 of your NCAA Manual, not the little blue folder, but the big green Manual.

So in this NC-6, we're taking the words that in last year's Manual were identical, and those are the italicized words, that is in last year's Manual 12.02.5 and 13.02.2 were identical and they were exactly as these italicized words. In this year's Manual, 13.02.5 is not the same as 12.02.5. So, therefore, what has happened between the two Manuals is that there was a change. There was a change from the 2000-01 Manual to the 2001-02 Manual.

So we're going to do an "if, then." Either 13 was changed with no delegate vote by any means, and there are four means to change it. You can amend it as we see in the white part of this. You can do it in an interim interpretation through any of the three groups that were mentioned. You can do it as a noncontroversial amendment, that's Appendix B, or you can do it as a modification of the wording of Appendix F. All of these require — and the word is very firm — shall. Shall be submitted to Convention delegates for a vote. Those words in 13 were not.

So since they were changed and since 12 and a form of 13 were identical, either 12 can be changed with no delegate vote, or since 12 is being presented for a vote, and since 12 and 13 were the same in the last Manual, 13 had to have been presented for delegate vote in order to be changed to its present wording. It was not. Neither case is true. It did happen, though.

So I call your attention to that. If you take the front cover of the green Manual, open the first page and the back of the first page under the NCAA symbol, it says two things. I will read the key sentence. It says: "Noncontroversial amendments and modifications of wording adopted by the Management Council are set off by a gray background and include an adoption or revision date." So any change before that I listed by delegate vote or any change in the interpretation category must be set off by a gray background. It must include the date. Look on page 70. It does not. So I would argue that this is definitely not noncontroversial. Thank you.

Mr. Courtice: Other arguments? We have no option here but to put it back in the noncontroversial package approved or send it to the Management Council. There are no other options this morning.

Steve Argo (Southern Collegiate Athletic Conference): On behalf of the Division III Interpretations and Legislation Committee, I urge the membership to include this proposal in the package of noncontroversial proposals adopted by the Management Council.

This proposal is necessary to standardize the legislation found in Bylaws 12.02.5 and 13.02.2, both of which define the term student-athlete. It is essential for these pieces of legislation to be the same. Why should the division have different definitions of student-athlete?

It is helpful to know how this proposal came forth from the Interpretations and Legislation Committee and was approved by the Management Council. Bylaw 13.02.2 was revised in response to a change, approved by all three divisions, made to the definition of a prospective student-athlete, recommended by the Infractions Committee. Changing the definition of a prospect facilitated a change to the definition of a student-athlete. Thus, the change was made to 13.02.2. At that time, 12.02.5 should also have been changed. This was not changed and that's why Proposal NC-6 was adopted by the Management Council.

Consistent with the definition of noncontroversial legislation and the ability of the Management Council to adopt such legislation between Conventions, this change will further permit the division to operate in a normal and orderly manner. Division III does not need more than one definition of student-athlete. Thank you.

Mr. Dodson: I'd like to reply to that. If this goes back to the Council, we are left with what we have, which we have been living with all this year. We would be left exactly where we are. In addition, remember that there is a Proposal 57 before you later today. So at the end of the day, whether this goes back to the Council, whether this does not go back to the Council, we will have a choice between three options.

Option one, if it passes, we'll have both 12.02.5 and 13.02.2 match. They will be identical to the bold-face print that you see. If it goes back to the committee, then it is possible — and be careful here; it may; it's possible — it may end up right where it is right now. That is it may end up with two, 12.02.5 and 13.02.2 different.

Third case, because we will vote on Item 57 in the white pages, it could end up there, at which case 12.02.5 and 13.02.2 again would be identical. So I don't want the audience to be left with the view that unless it goes back to committee it can't be identical. It can be identical by voting for No. 57.

So there are various options here. The main thing that I want to make very clear, and I hope I made clear in my opening remarks, is that as members, you have certain rights. You have constitutional rights and you have rights guaranteed, I believe, by the front cover of our Manual. I'm talking in very general terms. Since I know we're going to vote again, the reason I protested was to point that out to you. Therefore, please do send it back to the committee as a recognition that you recognize that, too.

Mr. Courtice: If there are no other comments, we will vote. If you vote in favor, it will be approved as a part of the noncontroversial package. If you vote against, it will be sent back to the Management Council. All those in favor, please raise your paddles. Those opposed? It's approved.

Let's move forward. I want to review the agenda and the timetable for the day. We have a full day in front of us. Our job between now and 5 o'clock will be to complete the Division III agenda as you see it in the Convention Program. We will meet until noon, at which time we break for lunch. We will reconvene sharply at 1 and meet until 5. No later than 5. The Convention Program identifies specific discussion and legislative topics we'll cover this morning and this afternoon.

Based on membership feedback, we will concentrate all of our voting in the afternoon and begin formal consideration of legislative proposals immediately after lunch. When that time comes, I'll turn the gavel over to Joy Reighn, and she'll review the necessary Convention-related parliamentary procedures and preside over the consideration of those proposals. There are 16 proposals, 40 through 55, that will be considered by a roll-call vote. Once we finish those, we'll take a short break. The first thing we'll do after our break is open the window for reconsideration related to the earlier roll-call votes. Finally, we will conclude with the consideration of the slate of Management Council nominees. We have a full agenda, and we need to try to stay on schedule.

If there are no questions regarding our schedule, I want to take just a moment of personal privilege as my term on the Presidents Council winds down and my assignment as Council chair ends. For lack of any introduction, I have titled these next three minutes "The Buck Stops Where." My topic is the work of the NCAA and in particular the work of Division III. Actually, I couldn't have offered these remarks four years ago because it's taken me all 48 months of this experience to begin to get it. I want to share these recent revelations with you.

If there is a consistent challenge that I receive as a member of the Presidents Council, whether it's within Division III as a whole, from the membership or within my own North Coast Athletic Conference or back on my home campus at Ohio Wesleyan, that challenge is an expression of frustration. The wheels of NCAA progress appear to grind painfully slow. Often they grind through a foggy bureaucratic maze.

Here's what I finally understand. The expression of frustration and exasperation with all of this can only be focused on us. When I joined the governance structure four years ago, I was aware that the NCAA referred to itself as a membership organization. Never has that term membership organization been more enlightening. It is the member schools and conferences of the NCAA, through the committee structure and the legislative process, that ultimately establish

the Association's structure, policies and procedures. We are NCAA Division III.

This is only the fifth year of the new governance structure. Three of the goals of this relatively new structure continue to be (1) nurturing more CEO leadership and involvement; (2) developing divisional autonomy through the federation; and (3) creating administrative simplification.

One, achieving greater CEO leadership remains a challenge. There are approximately 40 Division III CEOs registered at this year's Convention. That's a number that's fairly consistent with recent Conventions. We can and must find ways to better involve and inform college presidents regarding the affairs of Division III. In the past year, the Presidents Council initiated regular e-mail updates and a Web site that serves CEOs directly. But more work remains, especially at the campus and conference levels. However, a prerequisite to greater CEO involvement is staff leadership. This is especially true of the issues at this national level. I'm happy to tell you that the Presidents Council has charged an uncomparably gifted and able staff in Division III with that responsibility.

Secondly, I believe we've been fairly successful in the area of establishing our place in the federation and in nurturing our divisional autonomy. The structure has permitted us to deal more effectively with issues of special importance to our division, and our strategic plan has been crucial in that regard. Not all divisions have taken the same strategic approach and not all divisions have charged the staff with the leadership responsibilities that I mentioned just a minute ago. I think our approach is working well in Division III on this level.

The third goal, administrative simplification, remains largely unattained. The NCAA at times remains an unwieldy bureaucracy and often appears to be awash in constrictional committees and strangled by reporting lines. To be sure, the structure of Division III is less cumbersome than that found in other divisions. But we can't let that fact lull us into a sense of false satisfaction. We must find ways to simplify the governance structure or at least make it more comprehensible and responsive to the Division III philosophies.

I think there are tremendous challenges inherent in making the changes that I've suggested. We probably don't all agree together on what kinds of changes should be effected. Our diversity as a division can make this especially difficult. While change can take significant time and energy, I'd ask you not to forget that the bureaucracy naturally favors the status quo.

I think there's good news in all of this. If the NCAA really is a membership organization, then collectively we have the ability to change it. There have been issues over the past few years that have divided the Division III membership even as they have been debated and voted in the last few years before this Convention. Whether it has been competition in the nontraditional season or redshirting or

automatic qualifiers, the size and the diversity of our Division III membership may be inhibited by our organizational good health and vitality. Future decisions about budget priorities, championships, financial aid policies and playing seasons run the risk of further fragmenting the membership unless we can address the potential for changes in the Division III landscape.

Recognizing this, the Presidents Council yesterday morning approved the appointment of a joint subcommittee of Management and Presidents Council members to begin work immediately to better articulate the academic and the athletic values within the sports cultures on our campuses and try to explore the manner in which we might organize ourselves in Division III around these values.

As a membership organization, the NCAA is what we make of it. Our new structure is still evolving. There has never been a better time to change it. It's up to us to make Division III reflect our wishes. Thank you very much. (Applause.)

We'll continue with our business session by receiving reports from the Presidents Council and the Management Council. To present the report of the Presidents Council, I would like to recognize Lee Pelton, president of Willamette. He served as a member of the Amateurism Task Force as well as the Presidents Council nomination subcommittee. President Pelton.

PRESIDENTS COUNCIL REPORT

Lee Pelton (Willamette College): Thank you, Tom, and good morning. It is a pleasure to present this report summarizing the work of the Division III Presidents Council during 2001. In the fourth year of the federated structure, we directed much more attention to the progress of the strategic plan and a few key issues, including communications with chief executive officers, as you have just heard. We wish to thank the Management Council committee structure for advancing the plans, goals and vision through their important work.

In that regard, the Presidents Council and the Management Council meet together each year at the Convention. This year's agenda focused on your strategic approach to two key issues: first, the budget, the balance between revenues, expenses and Division III reserve as it relates specifically to expenditures for championships and Division III initiatives; and second, Division III financial aid.

Division III's voice in Association-wide issues continues to be critical and important. As you know, that voice is expressed in the NCAA Executive Committee by the Presidents Council's chair and vice-chair. We must continue to have a vigorous voice within the Executive Committee, particularly as it relates to budget items and the key Association-wide issues that can affect us, such as membership growth and amateurism, which we'll be discussing today.

The Presidents Council also approved the work of the Convention Planning Committee. It is our hope that the one-day business session format, along with the related Association-wide discussion sessions

and a Division II and III chief executive officer session, will serve to encourage greater involvement of chief executive officers and result in a more efficient and effective experience for all.

Finally, I'd like to touch on five issues of substance on which the Presidents Council focused during the past year. The first is budget and strategic planning. The Council approved the 2002 and 2004 strategic plan and related budget. We did this in concert with the Association's migration to a two-year budget process. The three priority planning objectives continue to be student athletic welfare, diversity and membership education and communication. As you know, we are allocating significant Division III revenues to directly address those needs in the division.

The Council also approved yesterday a recommendation that reserves not fall 15 percent below the division's budget allocation during the 2002 and 2004 and 2004 and 2006 budget cycles. In addition, it voted that any unallocated resources will be used to further increase the reserves. Though this policy will limit the future growth of our budget, especially during the next four years, it is necessary for fiscal prudence.

I hope, as do all of my colleagues on the Presidents Council, that the membership continues to access the new resources available through many Division III initiatives and thereby enhance the welfare of the Division III program. The Council was pleased with the results from our first year of those programs. You will receive an update regarding the strategic plan and initiatives in a few minutes.

The second issue is amateurism, as it is embodied in Proposals 40 through 44. The Presidents Council generated this issue on several occasions during the past year. We support this legislation because through common sense, clarity and renewed commitment to amateurism, it will shift the focus of initial eligibility from the various objective intent to professionalize to weighing the student-athlete's actual competitive experience before he or she has enrolled as a student. It should be noted that pay for play will remain impermissible and the guidelines regulating student-athletes following their collegiate enrollment will not change for Division III.

This Division III philosophy regarding deregulation, competitive fairness, common sense and, of course, student-athlete welfare, are at the core of this issue. You will be given an opportunity to express your points of view on this important subject one final time later this morning prior to a vote on the legislative proposals before you.

Division III financial aid. The Presidents Council is withdrawing Proposal No. 46 that would mandate an annual audit comparing the financial aid packages of 10 percent of student-athletes with a comparable number of nonathletes. Feedback from a pilot project this fall has indicated significant concerns with cost, with scope, frequency and accuracy of the audit results. The new Division III Financial Aid Audit Task Force, as you have heard, will be chaired by Simpson College President Kevin LaGree and will be asked to develop a new

financial aid audit proposal at the 2003 Convention.

The Council also took up the issue of championships. It recognizes continued interest of the membership in championship enhancement. However, it also believes that current legislative proposals to revise the Division III championships automatic qualification process are premature and should be referred to the Championships Committee as part of its thorough review of the entire automatic qualification process, which is already underway.

The principle of access continues to be a priority for the Council. At the same time, creating additional participation opportunities has significant budget implications and must be done in conjunction with other division priorities and available resources. We will discuss timetables and budget implications related to championships enhancements in more detail later this morning.

Finally, provisional membership. The NCAA has struggled with explosive membership growth recently and is currently under its second membership moratorium in six years. Proposal No. 45 will establish a more comprehensive and approved process and limit to six the number of schools permitted to join Division III on an annual basis. We urge your support of this proposal.

Finally, we selected and welcomed Ivory Nelson, president of Lincoln University, and Margaret O'Brien, St. Mary's College of Maryland, to fill immediate vacancies. We also welcomed three new elected members, whose terms began at the close of this session: Esther Barazzone, president of Chatham College; David Carter, president of Eastern Connecticut State University; and Phillip Stone, president of Bridgewater College in Virginia. The Council elected Bette Landman, president of Arcadia University, to serve as chair, and John McCardell, president of Middlebury College, to serve as vice-chair.

Finally, the terms of service of three members will conclude at the conclusion of this Convention: myself; Stan Caine, president of Adrian College, to whom we wish to extend our sincere and heartfelt gratitude for his commitment and leadership to the division; and last, but not least, we would also like to acknowledge Tom Courtice, president of Ohio Wesleyan University, who has served with great distinction as chair over a number of very difficult issues for the past year. Tom, your time and energy and your commitment to our division has been exemplary and we wish to thank you very much for it. That concludes my report. Thank you very much. (Applause.)

Mr. Courtice: Thank you, Lee. You're nice to include in your report those sentiments. It's been a privilege to serve as chair during the past year. I, too, would express my gratitude on behalf of all the membership to those Presidents Council members departing.

To present the Management Council report, I'd like to recognize Oscar Page, president of Austin College. He has served on the Division III Budget Committee and Administrative Committee, among other assignments. President Page.

MANAGEMENT COUNCIL REPORT

Oscar Page (Austin College): Thank you very much, President Courtice. On behalf of the Division III Management Council, I am pleased to provide a report on our work during the year 2001. This has been a year marked by significant discussion, dialogue and debate on key issues that resulted in legislative proposals that the membership will have an opportunity to vote on later today. The Council would also like to express its appreciation to members of the Division III Presidents Council for their leadership and empowerment, which has permitted the Management Council to address the various issues that we have considered.

I'd like to offer a special word of thanks to the Convention Planning Committee. As you will note in the Convention Program, there are a few changes that have been made in the format for the Convention. The efforts and work of the committee are evident in these changes, with an expansion of the Association-wide professional development sessions that we engaged in over the last two days, as well as our new business session format, which includes discussion this morning and voting this afternoon. The Convention Planning Committee, Management and Presidents Councils will be anxious to receive your feedback in our post-Convention questionnaire.

The Council would like to thank the members of the Division III and the Association-wide committee structure for their work during this past year. As President Courtice noted in his comments, this is a membership organization and you play a major role in the work of this organization. There are hundreds of you who participate in these committees, and the committees provide the input to the Management Council for Management Council consideration on issues. The Management Council reviews the work and recommendations from Division III and the Association-wide committees. We applaud the working relationship that the Management Council has with the committee structure. The work of these committees is highlighted in the quarterly Division III newsletter and The NCAA News and is available on the NCAA Web site.

During the past year, we spent considerable time on issues related to amateurism, the proposed financial aid audit process, provisional membership and education, and the budget. Much of the work of these committees is reflected in the 26 legislative proposals and related amendments we will consider this afternoon, including 14 submitted by the Division III membership.

A few key Association-wide issues addressed during the year included the NCAA position relative to the confederate battle flag as it relates to NCAA championships competition; provisions in the NCAA Sportsmanship Sports Person of the Year Award and the Theodore Roosevelt Award; and the extension of the sportsmanship exception for women's emerging sports through the 2008-09 academic year.

At our recent meeting, we received the NCAA membership report

in response to the two-year membership moratorium and the explosive growth over the past few years. Proposal No. 45 is the result of the year-long work of the Membership Committee to present a long-term Division III membership plan, which you will have the opportunity to vote on later today.

At the 2001 Convention, the membership adopted legislation to delete the awards review process for permissible financial aid awards given without consideration of need. The legislation will become effective August 1, 2002. The Financial Aid Committee and the Council spent considerable time discussing and debating the development of a financial aid and audit that included a pilot program. The Council wishes to extend words of appreciation to the 19 Division III pilot institutions and their financial aid administrators for providing invaluable data and information. You will hear a detailed report, including pilot results, the commitment of the governance structure and future plans related to Division III financial aid later in the discussion this morning.

In the area of championships, we reviewed recommendations regarding the automatic qualification process in response to membership feedback and endorsed a series of strategic championships budget priorities. We also addressed the importance of better budget planning and projections in light of a significant championships budget deficit incurred during 2000-01. These critical issues, including positions on membership-sponsored Proposal Nos. 47 through 50, will be presented in greater detail by members of the Championships Committee later this morning.

As President Pelton noted, amateurism deregulation is before the Division III membership for adoption. The Amateurism Task Force has spent a considerable amount of time educating the membership, receiving input and addressing issues related to the legislation over the last year. We hope delegates have the opportunity to review the educational video mailed in November. We wish to thank the Amateurism Task Force for their leadership in this area. The Council reviewed the results of the first full year of Division III initiatives. The first year, in summary, along with new programs and initiatives, will be highlighted by John Biddiscombe, chair of the Initiatives Task Force. The Council is pleased with the outcomes and notes that Division III member institutions and conferences have clearly benefitted from the various programs and initiatives.

We also welcome Marcia Kierscht, president of Stephens College, and Bob Malekoff, director of athletics at College of Wooster, to the Council this year.

In conclusion, the Management Council wishes to thank those individuals whose terms of service will conclude at the close of this Convention: Dee Fairchild, director of athletics at Grinnell College; John Galgano, Manhattanville College, who is concluding his term as the representative of the Division III Student-Athlete Advisory Committee; Joy Reighn, director of athletics at Rowan University;

and myself. We will all conclude our service on the Management Council.

I want to say a special word of thanks to Joy. Joy has provided excellent leadership over the past year for the Management Council. She's brought humor, good sense and wisdom to the dais and we appreciate her great leadership. We also want to express appreciation to the staff — Dan, Bridget, Chris and others who have supported us in a very significant way.

Finally, we congratulate the newly elected chair, Christopher Walker, faculty athletics representative from the University of Redlands, who will serve as chair, and Susan Bassett, director of athletics at William Smith College, as vice-chair, for the upcoming year.

The Management Council and the Division I committee structure dealt with many significant issues during the past year. We remain challenged with what lies ahead. As Tom has outlined, there are many challenges before us, and we encourage you to be a part of the consideration of these challenges.

As I conclude my report, I want to thank you and members of the Management Council for the opportunity to participate in the governance process of the NCAA and extend my best wishes in future considerations. Thank you. (Applause)

Mr. Courtice: Thank you, Oscar. I know that the membership echoes the expression of appreciation to all of the Management Council and in particular those folks who are leaving the Council. While we're passing out words of gratitude, there are two other groups that I would like to acknowledge. One consists of those who serve in the NCAA governance structure. It's only through their hard work that the business of this group is accomplished. If you've served on any NCAA committee during the past year, could I ask you to stand, please? If you've been on any committee, would you stand for a minute? On behalf of the membership, let us express our thanks to all of you. (Applause) If others are interested in committee service, I'd encourage you to contact members of the Nominating Committee or the staff. They can answer any questions regarding vacancies and the nomination and selection process for committees.

The other group I would like to acknowledge are those who have hosted NCAA championship competition in the year. It takes a lot of work and championships don't take place without a great deal of commitment by the individuals at the host school. This work results in a quality championship experience for our student-athletes. If your school or your conference office has hosted any round of an NCAA championship, could I ask you to stand and accept the recognition of the membership group? Anyone involved. Thank you. (Applause)

Now we're ready to begin our morning discussion sessions. I'd like to make just two more points as we move into that. In an attempt to avoid dismantling any more of the Indiana landscape and cutting down any more trees, we will not be distributing handouts for these discussion sessions. Instead, each session will be presented in a

Powerpoint format. The agenda and the Powerpoint presentation are available on the NCAA Web site.

Second, we will not distribute written reports from each Division III and Association-wide committee or hear from the committee chairs. The quarterly Division III newsletter provides ample opportunity to the membership to follow the work of each committee. Articles on the committee issues also appear in The NCAA News.

We're now ready for that first report, an update on the status of our task force initiatives and their relationship to the strategic plan. This program is bringing our strategic plan to life and helping redefine what Division III is in fact about. To present the report, I'd ask John Biddiscombe to come forward, director of athletics at Wesleyan. He serves as chair of the Initiatives Task Force and is a former chair of the Management Council. John.

INITIATIVES TASK FORCE REPORT

John Biddiscombe (Wesleyan University, Connecticut): Thank you, Tom, and good morning, everyone. On behalf of the Division III Initiatives Task Force, I am pleased to provide you with good news. We have now reached the mid-point of the three-year plan to allocate resources to address the strategic planning objectives. These objectives are student-athlete welfare, diversity, membership education and communication. You, the membership, have taken advantage of the available funding and provided your athletics departments with many new programs. Well done.

The discussion topics and presentations over the past two days have reinforced that there exists many issues in Division III athletics that need our full attention. Most of these issues are identified in the strategic plan. The challenge for us is to look beyond the playing field and use our collective creative energies to develop educational programming and enhance communication and diversity in the division.

Looking back to year one of the Initiatives Task Force, we received a jump start by utilizing \$2.85 million from the Division III reserve. That money, along with the addition of \$349,000 from new revenues, provided grants to women and minorities to attend the NACWAA/HERS Institute for administrative advancement; the NACDA Management Institute; and enhanced postgraduate scholarships for women and ethnic minorities.

New funds were also used to improve the Division III Web site and to bring 31 conference commissioners together in Indianapolis for important discussions and support the membership from independent institutions to attend membership sessions in conjunction with NCAA regional seminars. Those meetings allowed conference commissioners and independent institutions to provide direct input to the NCAA staff and to hear firsthand how they could gain access to new funding.

During the summer of 2001, the task force selected 84 initiative

proposals from 104 submissions and awarded a total of \$461,225. In all, 249 institutions will benefit from the grants and thousands of student-athletes will be directly impacted. The selected grants focused on alcohol education, programs to foster good nutrition, enhanced athlete and spectator sportsmanship, and to create student leadership training.

The third phase of the initiatives will expand on a student leadership program, providing for two annual NCAA regional student-athlete leadership conferences. All the grants that were selected included a detailed budget, explained the tools to be used in measuring the desired outcomes and will be closely monitored by the NCAA staff.

I thought it would be helpful for me to tell you about some of the proposals that were selected. The Massachusetts State College Athletic Conference used its grant to hold an overnight, weekend-long student leadership conference in November where a facilitator worked with SAAC members to enhance their leadership skills. Three other conferences were awarded funds to promote sportsmanship. The North Coast Athletic Conference selected Dan Doyle from the Institute for International Sport to conduct a series of sportsmanship seminars on member campuses. The Southern Collegiate Athletic Conference will use its grant money to disseminate the message of sportsmanship to athletes from 10 conference schools. Also, eight institutions were selected to receive STARR pilot grants to promote responsible use of alcohol by their students. Two member schools, Fontbonne College and Mills College, received grants to celebrate diversity on their campuses. These schools are planning events that will promote a climate where diversity will be embraced.

Also, an important goal of the Division III strategic plan is to increase the number of women and ethnic minorities in leadership positions in collegiate athletics. This will be accomplished by increasing postgraduate scholarships for women and minorities, as well as grants for the NACWAA/HERS program and the NACDA Institute. In year three, \$750,000 will become available to member institutions to implement the Strategic Alliance Matching Grant Program. Finally, \$240,000 has been allocated to support 30 two-year, full-time women and minority interns and two additional Division III NCAA fellows.

The task force funding has also been used to support championships. The addition of Division III championships in women's golf and ice hockey were a part of the allocations for student-athlete welfare. Also, the task force directed \$316,000 to be used in championship travel party increases, officials fees and participant increases. At its October meeting, the task force voted to reallocate \$150,000 to the Budget Committee for championship overages from the 2000-01 budget. The task force also authorized the use of an additional \$420,000 of initiatives funding from the 2002-03 budget to support the current Division III championships. Specifically, a base budget

adjustment, with an additional \$150,000 from the 2003-04 initiatives budget to support championships and financial aid education.

Before I conclude my report, I want to emphasize that all of the Division III initiatives, along with a timetable and an explanation of this middle process, is available on the NCAA Web site. I encourage you to take a look at these pages and to prepare a proposal for the task force to review this coming summer.

Finally, I want to thank the members of the Initiatives Task Force for their wisdom and energies on your behalf. Their names and schools and conferences they represent are before you on the final slide. Thank you for your attention. (Applause)

Mr. Courtice: Thank you, John. That is perhaps among the most important work we are doing as a division right now, and clearly you get our attention when you discuss new resource allocation for all of us. We're grateful for that as well.

The next discussion session will focus on amateurism and the amateurism legislative package — Proposal Nos. 40 through 44. I'd ask that members of the Amateurism Task Force who will participate in this session to please come forward at this time.

I am sure you recall this. This is a very significant legislative package. It challenges some of our traditional exceptions regarding student-athlete welfare. This is the opportunity we all have to hear from and question members of the task force prior to this afternoon's vote. To begin the discussion, I will ask once again Lee Pelton from Willamette if he would come forward and begin the process of introducing the panelists. Lee.

AMATEURISM LEGISLATION REPORT

Lee Pelton (Willamette University): Thank you, Tom. Division III amateurism issues of preenrollment. I'd like to emphasize from the outset that the amateurism issue is a preenrollment issue. It asks the important question: Who and under what conditions is a student eligible to participate in NCAA sports? It applies to student-athletes before their initial enrollment. It does not in any way modify so-called amateurism rules or amateurism principles as they apply to enrolled students or as it applies to students after they have enrolled, unless they have had a significant preenrollment athletic experience that is different in degree and kind from their peers.

The Amateurism Task Force believes that this guiding principle is clear; it's rational; it's common sensical; it's based on principle; and that this is the way it should be. There are several members of our task force who appear before you. I won't introduce them because I'm assuming we can all read what's in front of us. Nevertheless, I want you to know it's a very diverse group and represents a variety of important experiences.

Our agenda will be an introduction, discussion of proposals, student-athlete perspectives, closing remarks and discussion. I would ask that you please save your questions and comments for the dis-

cussion section and permit us to move forward.

The task force began with a set of clear core values. These values were developed over time and with lots of discussion and feedback. I think they are values that I would hope that all of you would heartily and eagerly support: clarity; common sense, and what I would call a reaffirmation of amateurism principles and rules; consideration of prospective student welfare; competitive fairness; and, of course, to support and sustain important Division III philosophies.

What are the reasons for change? The first has to do with so-called deregulation efforts. It's the belief of the task force, which is in many ways reaffirming the belief of the membership, that consideration of this issue and any issue relevant to how we conduct our business, should strive for less rather than more NCAA regulations.

The second, as I've already said and you will hear many times during this presentation, is that student welfare should always be in the forefront of our considerations on issues that affect their conduct and their engagement and their relationship with our institutions.

Third is the impact of changes in Division I and Division II. I don't mean to suggest that we would argue that Division III ought to adopt these changes simply because of changes that have already occurred in Division II and changes being contemplated in Division I, but rather that there are important consequences of those changes that will affect Division III unless we enact similar kinds of rules based on similar considerations.

Finally, the reasons for change relate to a shift in focus from the so-called intent to professionalize to a consideration of competitive experiences. I want to spend a little bit of time talking about that.

As you all know, we have in our consideration of who is eligible this notion of intent to professionalize. The NCAA asks whether or not a reasonable person would conclude that an athlete's actions, behavior and associations with a sport before he or she was a student constitutes an intent to become a professional. An intent to professionalize includes, but is not limited to, the following sorts of consideration. Was there direct evidence of an intent to professionalize through the signing of a contract through a professional team? Did he or she sign with an agent or play with a professional on a tennis tour and so on. Did he or she even play with a professional team? If so, what level of participation? What was the amount of financial compensation, if any, and from whom did he or she receive it? These are important questions that go into trying to determine intent.

The committee wants to ask if this kind of scrutiny makes sense. We say no. Does it promote student welfare? No. Is there a better approach? The answer is yes. The answer to that is to consider and emphasize the student's obligation as a student once they are enrolled as a student. Let's not focus on what he or she intended to do. Intent is very subjective and very difficult to determine. Let's not focus on what he or she intended to do before they were even a student; but rather, let's focus on their actual competitive experiences

and make judgments about those experiences in terms of what relationship they ought to have with our institution.

As you can imagine, and as you see and recognize, that intent is not easy to discern. Under our current rules, in order to encourage equitability and maintain competitive fairness, signing a contract, for instance, revokes forever the opportunity for a student-athlete to participate in NCAA sports. I think we're all aware of the prospective student-athlete who signs a contract to play professional baseball. He plays five or six games, does not receive any compensation besides some dusty shoes and a bat and a hat and meal money, and loses his eligibility to pursue his sport at the college level because of the signing of the contract.

These are our current rules. This is a way of determining intent, signing a contract suggests that he intended to professionalize. We refer to this as a so-called failed professional. For me, I think of this not as a failed professional but really as a failed amateur. There's a sense in which we, through our current rules, have failed that student. These amateurism proposals seek to rectify that.

How does it do it? It does it in two ways. It takes into account the student-athlete's competitive experiences. What did he or she do before enrolling as a student, not what did he or she intend to do. It provides relief for honest mistakes, ignorance, and so-called failed professionals in a balanced, in a rational, and in a philosophically based approach that values student welfare but militates any competitive advantage that the actual experience may have accrued to the student.

Finally, we all want to be reminded of the important principle of amateurism that you see before you. The Amateurism Task Force believes that we should never lose sight of the fundamental idea that intercollegiate competition always should be connected to the educational enterprise. I know that we all believe that athletics should broaden, not narrow, the educational experiences of our students and contribute to the emotional and personal growth of our students and make real on the playing fields and the arenas many of the classroom lessons that contribute to the education of young men and women.

These are important principles that we believe are reinforced by the amateurism proposals that are before you. We urge you to give them serious, serious consideration. Thank you. I will now turn the podium over to John Harper, who will discuss in more detail the actual proposals. Thank you.

John Harper (Bridgewater State College): Thank you, President Pelton. President Courtice's comments notwithstanding about killing Indiana trees, there is a handout on the table. We thought it might be helpful for you take a look at those as we talk about the individual proposals. They might help to address some of the concerns that have been raised these last couple of days in the halls of the Convention.

I bring that up as a point because I have never really been

involved in a committee before that has taken more input from the membership than has the Amateurism Task Force. I think that's good for two reasons. Number one, it shows that the task force is interested in your input. But number two, it's good because you have the input. There are a number of people who are skeptical; there are a number of people flat out scared; and there are a number of people who just don't like to change. But I think all of you are very interested in the discussion and are willing to take and balance the information before you.

Having said that, the three core principles that I would like you to keep in mind as I run through these very briefly is the fact that these three proposals are designed to catch those who would already be ineligible under our existing eligibility rules. This is nothing that's going to be a blanket net that's going to make things worse. Second of all, these proposals are designed to address competitive advantage that a prospective student-athlete might gain from some of these changes in eligibility prior to initial enrollment. The third one, which is perhaps the most important, is the fact that these proposals would handle these situations in a much more fair and equitable and uniform manner, which is in line with student welfare.

The first proposal deals with seasons of competition. As you can see on the screen, this particular proposal relates to the core of the package. As a result, we're voting on it first. It would charge the student-athlete with a season of competition for every year he or she engages in organized competition after high school and before initial enrollment. One of the things the task force talked about was the very important fact that if a prospective student were to fall in this category, that student-athlete must fulfill a year in residence once they come to a member institution. We'll talk about that in just a second.

One of the other things I would like to specifically point out is that this would be sport specific. For example, if there is a prospective student-athlete who signed a contract or was drafted and played in the sport of soccer, these rules would be applied. If that person were also a lacrosse player, the sanction would not apply for the spring semester for that student to play soccer.

As I said, this would charge the student-athlete with a season of competition each year between the time they leave high school and the time they enroll in a member institution. One of the major concerns that we have heard from the membership early on that we have not heard so much anymore is the year in residence. There was a lot of concern about how this would be unfair and expensive. There were a lot of concerns. The best way that I can explain this to you would be the fact that any of the sanctions put in place would actually be put in place prior to the student's enrollment at your institution. If a student were to have this rule invoked, there would not be this heaping of penalties on top of him or her.

There's an example on the next slide of a student-athlete who

graduated from high school in the spring of 2001. Actually, I'm going to give you a one-year example first because I think it might be a little bit easier to digest. The student plays one year on the tennis circuit between the time that he or she graduates from high school prior to enrolling in your institution.

He or she accepted prize money and then enrolls in the fall of 2002. So there's a one-year window. Under this particular scenario, the student-athlete would be charged with one season of competition, which would mitigate the competitive advantage he or she had on the tennis tour and would be required to sit what technically would be his or her freshman year at your institution.

The thing to remember is the fact that it's not a one-year plus a one-year penalty to make it a two-year penalty. It is a one-year sanction. So the year of competitive eligibility would have been removed, and that person sitting his or her freshman year at the institution, demonstrating his or her dedication at your school, then would pick up his or her eligibility in their sophomore year. If we were to expand that to a two-year tour out on the tennis tour, the sitting period would still be the same at your institution, except that person would be charged with a second year of competition. After he or she sits their freshman year at your school, they would be coming into their third year of eligibility. So it is only a one-year sanction, if you will.

The organized competition definition is the one that many are concerned about, and I will take a stab at that. If I could go back, I'm sorry. On your chart, I'm not going to specifically go over those particular examples, but on your chart, Examples 1 and 2 would apply to the seasons of competition. If you look down the chart, we have two No. 3s, so I don't want to confuse you. We'll refer to one as 3 and one as 3-A.

The organized competition rule would be defined as any team competition if any participant accepts above actual and necessary expenses. This is an important distinction. We wanted to be sure that the student we were putting any type of a sanction on was not going to be penalized for playing what we have referred to as a hacked league in church or if they have been on a league team and made a bus ride from Town A to Town B and given a ham sandwich on the way. This restriction would not apply to those individuals. It would apply to any competition in which the individual accepts pay in any form based on place finish. Obviously, that is very important because that sort of talks about the pay-for-play situation that we have eliminated from the proposal.

We also have any competition pursuant to the signing of a contract or entering the draft. As President Pelton said, this goes a step farther from the intent to professionalize. We have found that there were many students who were signing contracts and really didn't even know what they were signing. But the key to this is any competition that takes place after the signing of the contract or the draft.

Finally, we have any competition funded by a representative of an

institution's athletics interest that is not open to all participants. An example of that is in the first No. 3 and is what we have been referring to as a free summer. When a student graduates from high school, prior to enrollment at your institution the following August or September, it's essentially a free summer for that student to do whatever he or she intends to do. Then, once they enroll, all of our current legislation applies. The other thing I did want to mention, too, is the fact that this would be sport specific. There were some concerns whether this would be a blanket sanction and this individual would be sport specific.

The third proposal would be on prize money. The best way to talk about this is money for place finish versus a guaranteed salary. If there is anything at all that talks about a guaranteed salary, that would be pay for play. That is not addressed in these proposals because you did not want them addressed in these proposals. But this would also allow a student-athlete to accept prize money. It does in fact historically, as far as the Student-Athlete Reinstatement Committee is concerned, impact the greatest number of Division III prospects. It's not a huge number, but this is the largest category.

The competition is already permissible. The accepting of the prize money is not. So if you think of the competition as being permissible, you realize we're talking about addressing competitive advantage. This is what we are trying to mitigate, the competitive advantage and not dealing with the prize money. We feel it's in the best interest of the Division III prospects, and the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee will speak to that.

There's one example that's been thrown about a number of times. You will remember the story that happened a couple of summers ago where I believe it was a sophomore in high school who was playing in a golf tournament and hit a hole-in-one and won a \$15,000 pickup truck as the prize. They actually had to stop what they were doing, run and call the NCAA and find out if accepting that truck would make that student a professional, which under those rules it would have.

In the examples you see before you, a student-athlete accepts \$50 based on a place finish in a road race during the summer. The current legislation would declare that person ineligible and he would have to buy back his eligibility with perhaps another sanction. Under the proposed legislation, there would be no eligibility consequence. The only difference, the competition is the same but the competition is already allowed. All we're doing is dealing with the fact that there might have been some money as far as place finish, and it has been our understanding or our commitment that that has not made a difference in the competitive advantage.

The next proposal is on competition with professionals. This is the one I've gotten the most discussion about this week at the Convention. Competition against professionals is already allowed under our current bylaws in individual sports such as tennis, golf

and running road races. If that makes sense for individual sports, the task force asks the question why does that not make sense in team sports as well, provided you have the sanction for seasons of competition to address the competitive advantage situation? So we feel this more equitably addresses the situation and allows the student to participate against and with professionals and still gives them an avenue to be reinstated as far as their eligibility is concerned. It makes a much more objective analysis for the Student-Athlete Reinstatement Committee to identify.

The next one is on contracts. This would allow a prospective student-athlete to sign a contract. There is no competitive advantage signing your name to a piece of paper. As President Pelton talked about before, it is very difficult to get into the head of a 17- or 18-year-old individual to find out if they actually intended to professionalize or they felt good that day and they wrote their name down. So we wanted to be able to identify those situations and more clearly deal with them. It is in fact in the best interest of the prospective student-athletes, and you'll again hear that opinion in just a second from the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee. We felt that permanent ineligibility was very, very harsh for what in many cases is a poor and immature decision.

Finally, I have an example that has happened a lot. It may have in fact happened to you. A student-athlete signed a contract with a professional baseball team. He was released because he was injured, didn't pass the physical, homesick. Who knows? Under the current legislation, he's toast. His eligibility is not reinstated. Under the proposed legislation, there would be no impact on the student's eligibility.

Finally, on the draft, for those of you who have either dealt with or had experience with high-level baseball programs in particular, you know that student-athletes can be drafted out of high school without their knowledge. We wanted to address both that situation and the situation where students are putting their name in for the draft. The committee feels there's no competitive advantage gained by putting your name in for the draft and it's in the best interest of the student-athletes. Permanent ineligibility is probably a little bit harsh for that. So the other thing to remember on that is the fact that in many cases a student-athlete who's drafted out of high school doesn't know that and a student who puts in for the draft will have a better idea of what his or her worth is for the draft, so there's also information that's made available to student-athletes to make that informed decision to begin with.

That is the end of the individual proposals. I'll now turn it over to Amy Huchthausen, who is a member of the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee. She will give you the student-athletes' report.

Amy Huchthausen (University of Wisconsin, La Crosse): Thanks, John. As a representative from the Division III Student-Athlete Advisory Committee to the task force, I wanted to share our

committee's perspective regarding these proposals. We believe these changes are reflective of today's sports culture. We further believe that the current amateurism rules are intrusive into the lives of prospective student-athletes who may have high aspirations but possess little knowledge of NCAA rules. These new rules give freedom to the prospects to make educated decisions regarding their lives while still maintaining equity.

We're also more comfortable with the entire group of proposals now that the pay-for-play piece has been removed. By doing this, we will not be penalizing those student-athletes who have made uninformed decisions but will distinguish themselves between those taking efforts to fully professionalize themselves. Our committee believes that the shift in focus from intent to professionalize to competitive experiences allows prospects to make informed decisions about what's truly in their best interest.

SAAC supports the academic year-in-residence and the seasons-of-competition rule and believes that success is a serious commitment to academics, which is at the core of Division III. Our committee believes that no advantage is gained between institutions with varying tuition costs because the student-athletes will have a maximum of three years of eligibility and be required to sit one year in residence while still needing four years to complete their degree. Therefore, a student-athlete would still be required to pay for four years of school just as they would if they were not subject to the seasons-of-competition rule.

Further, our committee is concerned about the possible impact changes in Divisions I and II may have on Division III. SAAC does not want Division III to become the dumping ground for student-athletes from Division II who will have to sit a year in residence. We feel these proposals bring a more objective analysis to the process and will treat prospects more equitably. While the number of prospects affected may be small, the severity of impact to even one student-athlete has displayed to our committee the need for these changes. Therefore, the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee supports the task force and believes these proposals are a major step forward for Division III and its commitment to student-athlete welfare.

I'll now turn it over to Tom to conclude with some remarks.

Tom Weingartner (University of Chicago): I'm going to make a few brief summary remarks. Before I'm brief, though, I've got a lot to say. No, I'm kidding.

Finally, let's be clear and remember one thing about this legislative package. It is not proposing pay for play. You've heard that. The feedback the task force received indicated that while everyone who responded was in favor of deregulation and enhancing student-athlete welfare, pay for play went too far and was a fundamental violation of the spirit and essence of our Division III philosophical tenet. So no pay for play.

I'll reference your case studies before you. Examples 9, 10 and 11

address the pay-for-play issue. Apparently, they include agents. In reviewing this legislative package and the best work of your task force, please keep in mind several important points.

First, the task force is responding to the very clear message from the Student-Athlete Reinstatement Committee that our current rules were too intrusive, too difficult to understand, too contradictory and too harsh.

Second, the task force is also mindful of the changes, as many of you pointed out, of the changes that have taken place in Division II and may well take place in Division I today. Without this legislation, Division III could become a dumping ground for some morally inept athletes who are too old for Division I or unwilling to sit out seasons in Division II.

Thirdly, it cannot be emphasized too much that this legislative action applies only to prospective student-athletes not under our jurisdiction. Our current high eligibility standards will continue to apply to our currently enrolled student-athletes.

Finally, a brief word about the proverbial slippery slope. While all the members of the task force understand that this legislation presents in some ways a radically different way of thinking about amateurism principles for pre-enrolled students, let's also recall that our notions about amateurism have been changing and evolving over time. They've been a real moving target over the last 70 to 80 years. With regard to that slippery slope, keep in mind that our current rules now allow for a professional baseball player to compete in basketball or other sports at the Division III level; Olympic athletes to receive training support, and perhaps after this Convention prize money, and still compete at the Division III level; a Division III athlete to accept prize money and become eligible simply by repaying or buying back his or her eligibility; a Division III athlete to compete against professionals.

I know from first-hand experience that our current amateurism rules are too difficult to understand and too harsh to apply to good kids out there who have made sometimes immature mistakes in judgment. In a regulatory approach, we took an amateurism principle that was intended for currently enrolled student-athletes and some time long ago began to apply it to pre-enrolled prospective students. Over time, in our typical fashion, we tacked on 11 exceptions to our amateurism rules and attempted to adjudge intent, as Lee pointed out, rather than something more objective and measurable. We ended up by inserting the regulatory hand of the NCAA in the lives of every 16-year-old athlete not only in this country but, as our globe has grown smaller, around the world as well. In many instances, these are kids and families who knew nothing about the NCAA's existence, let alone our Division III rules.

In the end, the task force supports our division's overarching effort to deregulate and to cut some of the fat and inconsistencies from our rules. We have always been a place that focused more on

students' experiences without overly burdensome regulation rather than focusing on commercial or alumni interests that are saddled in other divisions. We've always been in a place where if you satisfied certain fundamental and educational and financial standards, you were issued a set of gray shorts and a T-shirt and given the opportunity to try out for a spot on the team. Consequently, all the members of the task force, both out in the audience and on the dais, are urging your most serious consideration of this legislative package.

Let me stop and open this up to questions. We have NCAA staff members and members of the task force on the dais. We also have task force members out in the audience. If you will step to the microphones, we will be happy to engage in discussion and dialogue.

Arleigh Dodson (Northwest Conference): I want to make very clear that I'm a supporter of this deregulation. I hope I speak strongly as a supporter. I wrote a letter to the group. I wrote in that letter, I quote: "I write as a strong supporter of the intent of the legislation. I just don't want the legislation defeated because of drafting difficulties." So I want to address some drafting difficulties I believe that are correctable, mainly because of the sponsorship of this coming from the Presidents Council. Under the constitution, they are the only people in this organization who can change things today. I'm going to suggest some very simple things that will help.

The first thing is that this is purporting to be an organized competition in putting that title there. We have already an organized competition rule that is different. It's 14.7.4.1 for basketball. All sports have an outside competition rule. One sport and only one sport has an organized competition rule. That's basketball.

Instead, what you are doing here in fact is not talking about organized competition, you're talking about restricted activities that you are going to charge and you do that as you come over into the body in the title of 14.2.4.3.2, activities constituting use of a season. So all you have to do is come out and go participation in restricted activities and you're giving those restricted activities.

You are the one who mentioned the complexity of the rules. I'd like to get the rules a lot more simple. I think one of the things you could do is at least use unique titles. We've already used the title in 14.7.4.1 of organized competition. The second thing is why did that even get there? It got there from exactly the point that you made and I raised earlier in my challenge.

It just happened — by mistake, I guess — but I have the 1999-00 issue of our Manual here and the 2000-01 and the 2001-02. If you follow through on this, you see that there was an error made as we shifted to our Division III standards. In fact, in 1999, they at least have the numbering right because the number was 14.2.4.4 and then they tried to make organized competition 14.2.4.4.5, which can't be. It can't be a sub of four. Then what happened is they just corrected the number in the 2000 Manual and then you get stuck in the latest one in trying to deal with the change that was made. That's Point 1.

Point 2. There is a quick way to deal with this, and that is when we deal with money, deal with money in the same way. We have in existence already in 15 a rule on ex-professionals and whether they can get financial aid. If you're professional, no. Subheading one, if you're an "X," yes. Subheading three, if you change your mind and take money again, that's it, you're done. The reason you're done is not because of that; you're done because on the basis of 10. The penalty is evoked on Article 10 because it's an ethics decision.

Substitute — we're talking money, professionalism, slide that over and simply talk about a contract. It takes three words. You don't even have to change sub two or sub three. And then if what you're doing in this task force is taking 12.1.1 and slicing it up, you don't have to do it. Change the one word "individual" to "student-athlete" with the 15.3 language and you're set.

Mr. Weingartner: Thank you, Arleigh. The staff reminds me that interpretations can be forwarded to the Management Council. That probably will address some of your concerns.

Dan Harris (Milwaukee School of Engineering): I have a question concerning competitive advantage. In Wisconsin, we have a very strong amateur soccer league, the Wisconsin Soccer Association. Many states have similar organizations. It's not uncommon for a team from that league to compete or win a national amateur championship. Many of the teams, although the athletes are not currently professional, have ex-professionals on their team and they have many, many former Division I players. If a young person would graduate from high school and not enroll in college and went and played a year, possibly two years, in that competition would he gain a competitive advantage according to this legislation? What in fact would be the outcome of his participation?

Mr. Weingartner: If he participated and did not accept pay for play, he would trigger the seasons-of-competition rule. For example, if he participated for two years, he would lose two years of eligibility and sit in residence for a year.

Mr. Harris: Even though there are no current professionals in that league?

Mr. Weingartner: No. I'm sorry, I thought you said there were professionals in the league.

Mr. Harris: Former professionals.

Jennifer Strawley (NCAA Staff): As long as no one on the team is receiving above actual and necessary expenses at that time, he would not trigger the rule.

Mr. Harris: So that would be considered the same as Example A, the church league?

Mr. Weingartner: That's correct. Other questions?

Dick Kaiser (Defiance College): I have a question as it relates to reinstatement and how this is different than what we used to reinstate athletes who were declared ineligible before. The situation at a former institution that I worked at had a nontraditional student-ath-

lete who was about 36 years old and decided to come back to college. Previously, that individual had participated in triathlons and iron person events and gained money. They were able to basically buy back their eligibility via payback of the prize money.

Under this new legislation, if that person had competed for four years in the triathlon/iron person and gained awards, would they have used all their eligibility and never been able to participate?

Mr. Weingartner: The answer is "yes." Four years would cause him to lose all eligibility.

Ms. Strawley: That's in that sport. Sport specific.

Wally Neel (Bethany College, West Virginia): I'm interested in why, if you look at 3-A with the tennis, an individual can recapture their eligibility, but if you look under Nos. 9 and 10, the basketball and baseball people cannot recapture their eligibility. They're both receiving pay for performance. I just wondered why there's a difference there.

Mr. Weingartner: We struggled with this issue for a number of months and received very clear instruction from the Presidents Council and the Management Council that advocating pay for play violated something fundamental to Division III. However, prize money we felt was appropriate. For example, the cross country runner, the distance runner who accepts \$50. The distance runner who accepts a T-shirt. It happens all the time. The distance runner who accepts a travel bag ought to be immediately eligible, we felt. There was a distinction between it and salary.

Dan Calandro (Knox College): Two questions. A little further clarification on the dumping ground theory, just to help clarify that for me. Secondly, the issue of the road runner who wins the \$50 while she is a senior in high school at the local St. Patty's Day run goes to college, comes back the next year and wins that same race as a freshman and can't take the money. How do we explain that? I support the issue, but I'm unclear what we would say to that young lady.

Mr. Weingartner: Let me take the first one, dumping ground. Division II has already passed legislation very similar to that proposed today for Division III. So if you have an older athlete, a more elite athlete, and we do not pass this legislation, it's possible that that athlete might not want to lose one or two years of eligibility, for example, if he or she had participated on a tennis circuit. That's a disincentive to enroll at a Division II institution. They would be immediately eligible at Division III, for example, if they were being paid prize money. So we might see some migration from Division II to Division III. There is an age limit at Division I. I don't think it's realistic to think that many Division I athletes would be competing at Division III, but still there's a disincentive for the older athlete.

Ms. Strawley: I think for the second question, as to why it would be okay for the prospective student-athlete to accept prize money but once they enroll in our schools not to accept it, the distinction that the task force made was that prior to enrollment, the activities that

they're engaging in don't necessarily have the same impact for not only our schools, but then also there's a chance to educate them and make them aware of what they can and cannot do. When they're prospects, that becomes a much harder task. So trying to police all the students prior to coming in is not as easy as once they enroll in our schools and we can actually educate them and tell them what to do and not do.

Mr. Weingartner: Is that the question you asked?

Mr. Calandro: It is the question. I think the follow-up part is, does it make common sense to tell the young woman now that you're here at Knox College, when you go back home and run your St. Patty's Day race, you can't take the money? But I've taken it for the last four years and that's okay. Yeah, that's okay but now that you're here, you can't take it. It just seems a difficult one to explain.

Mr. Weingartner: Let me elaborate on Jen's comment. We felt very strongly that we wanted to enforce our values and our rules for those students who are enrolled in our colleges currently. It is growing increasingly difficult to impose these values on 14-, 15-, 16- and 17-year-old kids in Iowa and California and Croatia and Greece. It's unrealistic to expect them to know the rules, to understand the rules, to abide by the rules. So we come down four square on being emphatic and strong and enforcing our values on the students who are currently under our jurisdiction, but not attempting to regulate the entire world.

Mr. Calandro: Thanks for the explanation.

Steve Sondergaard (Defiance College): It may be a moot point after the last statement, but we're all educators in this room and one of the issues I have is for the student-athletes. They wish to make informed decisions. How can we get that information out to them as student-athletes so they can make these decisions? Whether at the high-school level and so forth, how do we get information to the coaches to help them? This seems to be lacking at this point, but I understand your last statement.

Mr. Weingartner: I'll leave that to another task force. We addressed that indirectly in recognizing the increasing impossibility of doing that, so we decided to focus on those students who were our students.

Lee Pelton (Willamette College): I wanted to go back to the previous question because I think it's an important philosophical issue that you raised. It has to do with the distinctions that we made between individuals before they enroll and after they enroll. This is why I continue to emphasize that the set of proposals don't represent a retreat or an abandonment from certain amateurism principles or philosophies, but really is a reaffirmation and a reenforcement of that. Of course, these are value judgments, but I think these are value judgments that most of us would agree.

I think what I would say to your student that we believe very strongly that athletics competition should be primarily for the sake

of competition rather than for financial gain. It should recognize a fundamental principle that athletics effort and competition are desirable even though nothing may come of them financially, because competition itself and the participation itself is a sufficient remuneration for the years of labor in your sport.

It seems to me that that's a fundamental amateurism philosophy that we embrace. It's one that we can and should I believe insist on for individuals who are our students in our schools. So for me, the answer to the question you asked is an important philosophical one in how you make these distinctions and that's what I'd say to these students. These are our values and you can choose to participate or not.

Don Harnum (Susquehanna University): I was just curious about the order of magnitude. Maybe a Division III prospective athlete wouldn't be a world class runner out of high school, but we keep talking about the \$50 prize and the bags and the T-shirt. What if, as a high-school graduate, I decide to run in five road races during the summer and the prize is \$500 or \$5,000. Am I allowed to compete at that order of magnitude for reward and still be eligible?

Mr. Weingartner: The answer is "yes."

Mike Hanna (Hobart College): In the case studies handout, I'd like further explanation of Example No. 2 where an ice hockey student-athlete competes for one year after high school in junior hockey. It's not uncommon for prospective student-athletes to compete more than one year in junior ice hockey. If a player were to play two or three years of junior hockey, would he still be immediately eligible under these proposed changes?

Mr. Weingartner: Let me defer to Jen Strawley of our staff on ice hockey matters. Essentially, there is no change. This legislation does not impact the current status of ice hockey. Jen, could you elaborate on that just a little bit?

Mr. Hanna: I understand. My concern is it's specified for one year.

Ms. Strawley: The rule would not be triggered under that circumstance, so the number of years wouldn't matter. As long as it's nothing but actual and necessary expenses.

Mr. Hanna: Thank you.

Mr. Weingartner: It's just an example.

Dick Kaiser (Defiance College): As the chair of the Division III men's golf championship, we are entering in some very dangerous ground. We are governed and run our championships by USGA rules. If a young man or a young woman prior to enrollment were to accept prize money according to the USGA rules, they become a professional. They can no longer compete in amateur events. So the only events they could compete in prior to enrollment would be professional events. If they compete in professional events, are they now not just accepting prize money? Are they using years of eligibility?

Mr. Weingartner: They are using years of eligibility.

Ms. Strawley: But only if they accept the prize money.

Mr. Kaiser: But if they accept prize money, they become a pro-

fessional. If they continue to compete, the USGA no longer allows them to compete as an amateur.

Mr. Weingartner: Let me make a comment about that. It piggy-backs on Lee's comments. There are lots of organizations out there that have different rules and regulations with regard to amateurism. It seems that nobody defines amateurism in quite the same way. The Olympic movement, professional golf, ice hockey and others. We eventually came to the position that we needed to do what was best, what was right and what was appropriate for our Division III athletes; to do what expresses our values for those athletes most appropriately. Of course, we tried to be sensitive to some of the differences in rules; various high-school associations have different rules regarding this, golf has different rules. But in the end, we came down on the side of doing what we felt was most appropriate and most right for our own athletes, and then let golf adjust accordingly or high-school associations adjust accordingly.

Chris Walker (University of Redlands): This isn't a question, but I thought it might be worthwhile to the membership to make a comment as chair of the Student-Athlete Reinstatement Committee. We are the committee that gets these appeals once these student-athletes are rendered permanently ineligible. I can't tell you what a very difficult and often heart-wrenching task this is.

In recent months, there was some suggestion that maybe we would be the committee that could handle this and right all the injustices. I can assure you that we look at the legislation very carefully because the legislation is a reflection of the intent of the membership. The Division III membership has made it very clear relative to this legislation. We also go by precedent. For example, if there's a student who signs a contract and someone's holding a gun to their head, yes, maybe as the Student-Athlete Reinstatement Committee, we might consider some relief. Other than a situation like that, it's heart-wrenching but we have to interpret it as the legislation directs us to interpret it.

Consider a contract or a draft piece. I can't tell you how many cases we get where I don't know why it happens but it happens. These young people get bad advice. They end up as what's been called failed professionals, but I like President Pelton's comment today, that they're really failed amateurs.

Also, personalize this to yourself. Consider many people in this room are parents with 17- or 18-year-old young people. You're in athletics so you know. The average parent really doesn't know. The parent doesn't tell them "that's bad advice." The parent says, "well, gee, the coach or whoever gave the bad advice, I guess it must be all right." So meanwhile, these people are rendered permanently ineligible. Try to explain that to a student-athlete. Try to explain that to their family. There's no competitive advantage.

I feel so bad after those calls sometimes. I think it gives our division a black eye in light of some of these things. I would just suggest

to you that these changes are in the best interest of Division III student-athletes and the membership. Thank you.

Mr. Weingartner: Thanks, Chris. I just want to say that this has been a complex issue. Your task force has worked very hard on it. We have attempted to reach out to the membership to get your input, and I think that we have crafted the best legislation possible. I urge your support when it comes to voting this afternoon. Thank you very much for your time and patience.

Mr. Courtice: Thank you, Tom, and to your colleagues on this important work for the NCAA. We are taking a break. We will reconvene in 15 minutes at 10:15.

[Note: The delegates took a 15-minute recess.]

FINANCIAL AID AUDIT DISCUSSION

Mr. Courtice: The issues that we are discussing this morning are obviously important, and there are two more on our agenda that we want to try to cover before lunch. To the extent that we do have legislation that follows, I think everyone hopes that the conversation can inform your own decisions and the way you may want to vote. That's not quite the case with the financial aid issue since the proposed legislation has been withdrawn; but in the long term, it's clearly an important piece of legislation for Division III. We'll start there.

This next discussion will update you on the status of this proposed concept of a regular financial aid audit. The prohibition against athletics financial aid is a unique feature of Division III; however, it is not without controversy. To begin this discussion, I will ask Ellen Shilkret, the associate director of financial aid at Vassar and chair of the Division III Financial Aid and Awards Committee, to chair this session. Ellen.

Ellen Shilkret (Vassar College): Thank you, and good morning. Before I begin, I'd like to introduce you to the people who will be presenting with me this morning. To my immediate left is Terry Rupert, director of athletics at Wilmington College; and Linda Case, who is the new chair of the Division III Financial Aid and Awards Committee. She is director of athletics at State University of New York, Brockport. Next is Gordon Finch, our membership services representative. To my right we have Kevin LaGree, president from Simpson College; and John Roush, president from Centre College.

Let me present the agenda for this morning. We're going to provide a brief historical overview of what the committee has been doing this past year, an update on Proposal 46 and what we've learned from the pilot program. Then we will look at the program audit results, the creation of the Financial Aid Task Force and then provide time for questions and answers from the membership.

First, let's focus on the work of the Financial Aid and Awards Committee during the past year relating to the audit model. Before you is listed the members of the committee from this past year.

Now, let's go on to a little brief historical overview. Over the past

two years, the NCAA Division III Financial Aid and Awards Committee has worked to establish a process to monitor financial aid distributed to student-athletes. At the 2001 NCAA Convention, the membership adopted legislation to delete the awards review process, which were the awards of circumstance and nonathletic achievement awards for permissible financial aid awards given without consideration of need, and reorganized Bylaw 15, making the financial aid legislation more consistent with the Division III philosophy, which prohibits athletic related financial aid and ensures that athletic participants are not treated differently from other members of the student body. The legislation will become effective August 1, 2002.

In an effort to replace the previous financial aid reward review process, the committee developed a financial aid audit model, 2002 Convention Proposal No. 46, and the committee sought input on the proposal from the membership during eight public presentations. The presentations were this past January at the NCAA Convention; in April and May at the three NCAA regional rules seminars; in May at the Eastern Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators; in June at NACDA and the Division III conference commissioners meeting; and in July at NASFAA, the National Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators. During these presentations and after, financial aid administrators, directors of athletics and conference commissioners were provided an opportunity to provide feedback on the proposed audit model.

The Division III Management and Presidents Council approved funding for 20 institutions to participate in a financial aid audit pilot program. The goal of the pilot program was to identify potential issues with the audit process and provide an opportunity for feedback from both member institutions and the auditing firms involved with the project. The 19 institutions now listed ultimately were selected to participate in the pilot program. The committee determined that a broad base of institutions with varying enrollments and offering a variety of sports would provide the best representation of the Division III membership. At this time, we wish to thank those institutions for their time and effort taken to participate in this pilot audit study.

I now would like to turn the presentation over to Terry Rupert, who will discuss the results of the pilot program.

Terry Rupert (Wilmington College): Thank you, Ellen. Obviously, the pilot gave us a lot of information, sometimes too much information. Let me share some of that with you and what we think is important. You're looking at the results.

Based on the feedback received from the membership and the audit results, the committee determined common concerns occurred in the areas of the scope of the study, the cost of the study, the frequency and the accuracy and results of the study. The participating 19 institutions were asked to have an external auditor compare 10 percent of the institutions' student-athlete population with an equal

number of files from the nonstudent-athlete population. We then went back and asked a few other institutions involved in the project if they would look a little deeper and give us a sport-by-sport comparison. This was done by internal audits, not with the first 10 percent being done by external auditors.

We found a couple things regarding cost. One big concern being what's this thing going to cost us? The average cost per institution was \$3,696.78. As we said before, we did the sport-by-sport comparison done by internal auditors and directors of financial aid. Before we brought this proposal up last year, we solicited a quote from outside auditors to get a "guestimation" of what this was going to cost us. The external auditors told us that it would cost between \$3,000 and \$5,000 per institution. So we were pretty much on the mark with what we thought cost-wise.

Obviously, we found a couple of other things about the cost of the pilot. One of them is the number of student-athletes' files by the external auditors reviewed directly affects the cost. So obviously, if you're reviewing more files, there's going to be more cost to the audit. Also, more specific data will increase the cost of the audit. If you want a sport-by-sport comparison or gender or anything like that, there's going to be more of a price tag to it.

As we get into more details as we go along here, we'll ask if you've got more specific questions. I'm going to turn this over to Linda Case, my colleague from SUNY-Brockport.

Linda Case (State University College at Brockport): Regarding frequency, the committee discussed the membership's feedback that indicated an external audit on a yearly basis might overburden financial aid offices. Other options that were discussed included an audit in the ISSG every five years or random selection of institutions by the committee to be audited each year.

The committee also weighed the pros and cons associated with the use of an external versus internal auditor. The internal audits obviously reduce costs. The ability also to report more specific data is available to us. There is also, perhaps, less reliability. In an external audit, we would find increased costs, less specific data, but obviously more reliability.

Before I turn this over, the committee would like to thank the chair of the Financial Aid Committee, Ellen Shilkret, for her great leadership, her humor and particularly her expertise in the financial aid world. She really helped us all a tremendous amount. At this time, I would like to introduce John Roush, president of Centre College, who will discuss the audit task force time line.

John Roush (Centre College): Thank you, Linda. Appearing on the screen are the members of the Division III Financial Aid Audit Task Force. The Presidents Council noted that the audit was valuable and identified significant issues with Proposal No. 46. Quite simply, more time is needed to resolve these issues. The Financial Aid Committee went as far as it could, but a more broad-based group is

needed to resolve the critical issues, including more financial aid officers from conferences engaged in audits.

The Presidents Council remains committed to an audit program for Division III. The task force is comprised of 15 members: six CEOs, four directors of athletics, four financial aid officers and one senior woman administrator, all of whom currently serve on the Management Council, Presidents Council or Financial Aid Committee. The chairs for the Division III Management Council and Presidents Council will serve as ex-officio members of the task force.

The charge of the task force is to continue to pursue the development of a financial aid auditing process and related legislative proposals for consideration at the 2003 Convention. The task force will focus on all of the following issues: audit scope, size, frequency, acceptable variance between aid for student-athletes and nonstudent-athletes, whether an external or internal auditor is preferable and, of course, the frequency of the audits. Further, where the random committee review would occur, we understand this would have significant cost implications and also call for some serious consideration of enforcement procedures.

To summarize the time line, it is our expectation that the task force will conduct two conference calls, one of which has already been held in December, in April or June, and two in-person meetings, the first of which will occur in February, with a follow-up meeting in May. The task force will ultimately submit proposed legislation for membership vote at the 2003 Convention. As you can see, our time line is very, very ambitious. We have a lot of work to do over the next six months. We believe that your feedback today will help us fulfill our charge.

At this time, it's my pleasure to introduce Kevin LaGree, president of Simpson College and the chair of the Financial Aid Audit Task Force, to take questions and receive feedback from the membership. Thank you.

Kevin LaGree (Simpson College): Thank you, John. As you can tell, this is a very important and challenging issue facing the Association. The prohibition against athletics aid is the cornerstone of the Division III philosophy and is embedded in our philosophy statement. It perhaps is the defining characteristic of Division III. The task force remains committed to the idea initiated by the Financial Aid and Awards Committee of developing a financial aid audit model that is both accurate and efficient. We must find a way to strike that balance.

As you have heard, we intend to develop a legislative model for consideration at the 2003 Convention. As noted earlier, the Financial Aid Committee received feedback indicating that the common concerns occurred in the areas of scope, cost, frequency and the accuracy of the results and the enforcement procedures.

To accomplish the ambitious and necessary charge set before this task force, and to bring an accurate and fair financial aid audit leg-

islative model to 2003, we need the full and creative input of the Association. So as a first step in our work, we now invite you to share your comments and suggestions as to the scope of the audit, its frequency, acceptable variances between student-athletes and nonstudent-athletes, and any other related issues that you think we need to consider. The microphones are open and we welcome your input.

Jeff Ankrom (Wittenberg University): I would like for you to talk about the term "acceptable variance" and how it will be made operational. I envision that we'll be comparing two means, and I think it would be helpful for us understand how that would work.

Kevin LaGree (Simpson College): One of the charges of the task force is to come up with the legislation that would embody that. We at this time don't know how that would work. We need input from the Association about what kind of variance would be appropriate. For example, if there was a difference in aid awarded between a student-athlete and a nonstudent-athlete for the same level of need, what is a variance that would kick out that as a concern that needs to be further extricated by the institution. We don't know. We need input from the Association to help us sort that out and decide what would be a fair and equitable guideline.

Mr. Ankrom: Thank you for that illustration. I think it's important for you to understand that you've brought into play the notion of control variables. I think it's important that this Association have a complete discussion about what control variables need to be brought into the discussion to decompose the difference between the two means. I can think of other factors as well.

Arleigh Dodson (Northwest Conference): You started this presentation with the edited material, the gray background material, and I want to call your attention to something that I think is a very important point that I would like the committee to perhaps cycle back. I know the efforts that you're doing the other way is great and I totally support it. But the issue of the maximum financial aid, first in the principle section, the .01 section, you talk about maximum financial aid. In the definition section, .02, you define a full grant-in-aid, a full GIA. I think what happened, I'm guessing, I have no idea, I've tried to trace it and you can't trace it through back issues. But because the maximum financial aid has the "whichever is less," we either get in DIII to use the cost of attendance or the DIII limitations, whichever is less. The last sentence of the .01 section, principles, has a difference between a full GIA.

So it appears as though you leave out a big section and that big section for us as a regional thing is the transportation and other related costs. So my appeal, I guess, is perhaps take another cycle back through the .01/.02 work that you've already done and be sure that they agree.

Mr. LaGree: We'll certainly do that.

Bill Klika (Fairleigh Dickinson University, Madison): I have a concern, as everyone does, with the budgets on cost. Is that a cost

upon the school or by the Association? I think I know the answer to that. Based on the fact that auditors charge by geographic region, would there be a limit? I certainly wouldn't want to be paying \$10,000 for an audit that someone in the Midwest might be paying \$3,000 for.

Mr. LaGree: As Milton Freedman once said, there's no such thing as a free lunch. The costs will still be borne by the institutions, whether it's borne by the Association or by the institutions. The question is what's an effective fair cost that's a reasonable cost? Currently, we're looking at an Association where the annual dues are \$900 a year and the average cost of an audit study is almost \$3,700 for the audit. That isn't going to work. One of the reasons that this legislation is being withdrawn is to get another go at that, to see what kinds of models we could create that would provide reliable, effective and fair information by which to make these judgments.

The task force will look at any number of models and possible ways in which to get the information collected and analyzed in ways that are effective and fair and efficient and don't cost too much money. "Too much" of course is a relative term. That's the problem.

Connie Zotos (Drew University): We were one of the institutions that probably rocked the boat a little bit on the accuracy piece, because the way our institution gives financial aid was totally inconsistent with the need factor. It's much more of a merit-based system. So the methodology didn't really work for us.

I would suggest that if we want to really have input into this process, that we all go back to our campuses and start to talk to our institutional research people and financial aid people to figure out what the methodology is for providing aid and have them start thinking about how you can take the two populations and do the comparison. I suspect that the methodology will in some ways come back to each institution's unique way of doing that. For you to start understanding that process and have those people provide input to the committee also. Thank you.

Mr. LaGree: That's a very good idea.

Debbie McGrath (Colby-Sawyer College): We also experienced the audit process this year. Our cost was probably closer to \$5,000, not that it matters. I echo Connie's words and also ask for us to go back and talk with our financial aid directors in terms of the process when we do the ISSG for each institution to also at that time have to comply with an audit. I'm sure you've thought of that. That's just a suggestion. If it was a one-time, five-year cost, I would also encourage that the reciprocal 10 percent be perhaps 20 or 25 to enhance that piece as well. Thank you.

Mr. LaGree: The ISSG connection was raised by the committee as well and is part of our working set of options. We welcome other sets of options as well.

Jeff Cohen (Brandeis University): I noticed that you were going to be making a presentation at NACDA. I wondered if you might be

able to do that at other conference meetings, maybe at the ECAC convention in April and October and also August. Keep that in mind.

Mr. LaGree: We'll certainly keep that in mind. One of the other issues that we want to communicate as well is to get good input and to try to communicate back what we can do.

Dick Kaiser (Defiance College): We also were one of the institutions that ran through the pilot program. In talking to our financial aid officer, we had a unique problem. Maybe others out there who have gone through the pilot program had the same situation. Small institutions like us that have a high predominance of student-athletes in their student population really skewed the results that you received. We were one of those institutions. There's going to have to be built into the next process some way to get a better sample.

Mr. LaGree: Yes.

Don Harnum (Susquehanna University): Has the committee considered trying to limit the scope of the analysis with this suggestion, having every institution establish some kind of on-campus base line so at least they all know how they would calculate what the institution's methodology or average is for all students? Then if they have a team that makes the NCAA championships, they compare that team's financial aid with the base lines already established. We're concerned about competitive advantage. If you're cheating at financial aid and losing all the time, to be honest with you, most of us don't care. (Laughter.)

Mr. LaGree: The committee tells me they have talked about that. We will continue to talk about it. We want to think of other ways in which we can provide effectiveness and fairness with a more limited scope of financial aid. Some suggestions, for example, have been that we do the audit only on awards to freshmen transfer students rather than all students. We want to look at all of those possibilities. We certainly at this point don't want to limit what we're looking at. We want to try to find something that's workable and affordable. We are at this point in time open to any suggestions whatsoever.

Connee Zotos (Drew University): I want to encourage the committee in its deliberation to always consider doing a sport-by-sport analysis. The reality of it, I think, is that if we all had open checkbooks, we would treat every sport equally and do the best we could for every sport. But for the most part, people run tiered athletic programs and run some sports differently than others. If there is inconsistencies in financial aid, I think it could only show up by a sport-by-sport analysis.

Mr. LaGree: Thank you. I think those of us who have seen the results of the audit, the material that comes sport by sport is much more illustrative.

Leon Lunder (Carleton College): I would support Connee's suggestion on a sport-by-sport audit but also use the idea of taking a look at first-year, first-time students at your institution, student-athletes and student population as well as first-time transfers to the institu-

tion, which would help reduce the scope of the audit. That would really help. The information I received back from financial aid directors indicates that financial aid doesn't change a lot after that first-time financial aid package. That would help in the scope of the audit.

The other piece that's going to be really important is the type of package in self-help versus institutional support for the individuals involved. I think there's a second piece of this that's really important. After the process is done, it may prove out that there is not a problem. But that's equally as important as finding a problem. I think there's a lot of innuendo, a lot of accusations that fly around, especially in Division III. It's important to compare the institution to itself, not to somebody else. I think that's the other piece. Just because you find out they're doing it right, they still may be doing it differently than you are.

Mr. LaGree: The legislation we adopted last year talks about that very principle, that we're comparing institutional awards between student-athletes and nonstudent-athletes.

Geoff Miller (Goucher College): One small point. I would just like some explanation. I know you've been very sensitive about communicating with various groups and constituencies. One of the things that I've learned from the process from my own financial aid representative was perhaps when this was presented to that professional organization, it was not well received because they felt that perhaps they didn't have as much input as they would have liked in the process. I'm simply asking will there be better communication?

Mr. LaGree: I'm sure we will definitely have better communication. That's our intent. That is a correct characterization of that presentation to the financial association.

Other input? Other questions? Comments to the task force? You have a list of our names. It's also on the NCAA Web site. We welcome your input; we encourage your input. Your ideas will all be treated with respect. We hope to find a way out of this. Because if we do this, it's very essential for our future to provide some way of providing accountability in the structure that's affordable and effective and that we all agree with. Thank you for your time this morning. (Applause.)

CHAMPIONSHIPS DISCUSSION

Mr. Courtice: Thank you, Kevin. We've heard lots of creative suggestions from people at Convention from year to year. I think probably Mr. Harnum's suggestion that we follow the drug-testing program in order to wait until we get to the championships to institute the financial aid program is maybe one of the more creative ones.

I would ask that the panel for championships step forward, please.

This is our last discussion topic of the morning, and we have the unusual luxury of having just a little more time on our side. This will relate to the current status of the future of the championships pro-

gram. The topic also will have legislative ramifications, including Proposals 47 through 50 that we consider this afternoon. I think you'll also hear about future championship plans and available resources. There's never a shortage of interest when it comes to discussion on championships. To lead the discussion, I will call on Brad Bankston, commissioner of the Old Dominion Athletic Conference and chair of the Championships Committee. Brad.

Brad Bankston (Old Dominion Athletic Conference): Thank you, Tom. Good morning to everyone. Fortunately, it sounds like we're going to have more time for our discussion today. I want to take the opportunity to thank you on behalf of the Championships Committee for the time that you've provided. We have plenty of information to send forth to you this morning.

A quick review of the agenda. It's a "Where have we been?" An introduction, a history and feedback from the membership. It's a "Where are we now?" Looking at where we have come up to this point with championships enhancements leading into 2001-02. It's a "Where are we headed?" Future plans of the committee and the discussion of 2002 Convention proposals. In the end, I'm sure we'll have ample time for questions and answers.

The first thing I would like to do is introduce the members of the Division III Championships Committee on the dais. First of all, Mr. Steve Argo, commissioner of the Southern Collegiate Athletic Conference; Amy Campbell, director of athletics at Bryn Mawr College; Suzanne Coffey, director of athletics at Bates College; William Eng, director of athletics at Bernard Baruch College; Dee Fairchild from Grinnell College, director of athletics. In addition, a current member of the Championships Committee, Mary Jo Gunning, director of athletics at Marywood University, and Joy Reighn, outgoing chair of the Management Council, also a member of the Championships Committee, from Rowan University.

We're also very fortunate to have three new members of our committee with us today who are not on the dais. First of all, a student-athlete representative from Carthage College, Jamie Flucker. In addition, Christopher Walker, now a part of the Championships Committee, is chair of the Management Council; and Steve Wallo, director of athletics from Lewis and Clark College, will also be joining us after the Convention.

Jumping straight into the presentation, the first thing we need to do is quickly review automatic qualification. The original premise of automatic qualification in the 1999 Convention was developed and consistent with two key principles: primary emphasis placed on in-season conference and regional competition, and to provide equitable access for conference members and independent institutions. The allocation of berths, Pool A being champions of conferences that qualify, with seven members being the key factor. Pool B covering independent institutions and schools from nonqualifying conferences; the allocation of B being determined by the number of schools eligible in

that pool divided by the ratio determined to form the bracket. And Pool C, the remaining bids from the brackets go to the teams from Pool A's that are not their conference champions.

There are a couple of things that you'll want to remember. First, Pool B and C both are selected on a national basis using the established criteria in no predetermined regional allocations. Second, under the current guidelines, they cannot be combined. In addition, no conference, regardless of its size, will receive more than one berth. The selection criteria for Pools B and C are derived from a specific set of criteria that stresses NCAA regional and conference competition. Specific issues dealing with the selection criteria are dealt with by the individual committees responsible for selecting the participants in the championships bracket.

Now, a time line and a quick review. In January 1999, as I referred to earlier, the AQ legislation was adopted. In April of '99, the Management Council and Presidents Council moved from a 1:8 ratio to a 1:7.5 and noted there would be no significant changes for the next two years.

From 1999 to 2000 was the first full year of AQ. The second full year of AQ was 2000-01 with no significant changes. We are currently in the 2001-02 year. The governance structure was instructed to review the AQ process. This also was the first year of the new five and five sports sponsorship requirement. In addition, in 2002-03, the moratorium expires on membership and the implementation of a revised AQ, should we have gotten that far through this process, that initially calls for base budget adjustments judging from the recent deficit in the championships budget.

We have made a concerted effort through this entire process to listen to the membership. In fact, we have done numerous things along the way, including guaranteeing access in Pools B and C with some additions to the bracket this coming year, as well as beginning discussion with the sport committees concerning definition of a region. We will continue to explore issues with the Championships Committee and other programs while keeping in mind the available resources at our disposal.

Throughout the next few slides, I'll show you the feedback the committee has received during the past year or so. If you remember, we had a presentation last year following the voting session. We also have had two presentations at NACDA and received numerous letters, as well as responses from our direct feedback form following the Convention presentation last year. In fact, we estimate we had over 100 responses from the membership, and we appreciate that.

In order to cover the material as thoroughly as we could, we divided into subcommittees. Mary Jo Gunning from Marywood University chaired the subcommittee on the AQ principle review. After sorting through the feedback, here are their themes. The first was greater Pool C access. It's clear that the membership is calling for change in some way, shape or form to allow more access in Pool C.

Two, regional alignment. Numerous concerns here were expressed, including an "X" mile radius to define the definition of a region, initiated by one sport committee that wants to actually go to all sport committees asking for their opinion on the definition of a region.

Three, the selection and evaluation process for Pool C. Concerns include the difficulty of evaluation of those pools using regional criteria on a national basis and the question of whether Pools B and C could be combined.

Four, the size and length of the championships. We were asked to review consistency in the length of championships. We've done that. We've approached it looking at the men's and women's soccer tournaments, trying to evaluate that, as well as concern over the timing of championships and their length in relation to academic calendars.

AQ requirements. The majority of people have supported the original legislation. There were questions of whether the leagues that met the AQ requirements should be required to accept a Pool A slide. We did handle that in a committee meeting and put forth a policy to cover that.

Geographic proximity and travel. There was concern for the geographically isolated institutions, not only with hosting, but also within the scheduling and selection process.

Access ratio as it relates to the size of brackets. We wanted to make sure that we remember as we reduce the access ratio that you can only grow to a certain point within our championships brackets that will allow us to maintain the current structure and the league format within those championships.

Finally, AQ principles being applied to the individual/team sports. This was something we did through the membership, and we carried through with that by discussing it with the sport chairs, as well as a recommendation for the Management Council, that we continue to focus on that as one of our major enhancements as we move forward.

Based on the common themes the subcommittee drew from your responses, some things are very clear. The first is, despite a few opinions to the contrary, the membership supports the current structure of Pools A, B and C. Thus, the committee believes and is committed to guaranteed access for all.

Secondly, we are committed to a system that does not penalize conferences and institutions that are strong, that have success, that's translated to a greater Pool C access in the long term. There's no question that the committee understands the strain on the system right now is at Pool C and it's something that we have to address. We've also discussed providing minimum access in Pools B and C in the short term.

If I turn your attention to the slide, in 2000-01 there was one sport that had difficulty with no Pool C bids. That was men's lacrosse. We handled that as quickly as we could. Entering the 2001-02 year,

there would have been four sports — men's and women's lacrosse, men's and women's ice hockey — lacking Pool C access. As a result, the Championships Committee recommended to the Management Council a policy that called for one or two Pool C berths in every sponsored sport, thus distributing opportunities in all four brackets for at-large selections. This policy also stands for Pool B as well, assuring independence in schools that are members of conferences without AQ access in the brackets should a championship field find itself without Pool B bids.

The committee is committed to examining the definition of a region. I mentioned that earlier. You will continue to hear that throughout the presentation. We have gone to the sport committees and are beginning to get feedback from them, and hopefully we'll have a chance to review that at our meeting at the end of this month.

We also recommend the continuous study of the application of the AQ principles to the individual/team sports. The committee met with individual/team sports chairs in August and posed the question to the group. Only one sport stood out and asked if we would really go forward with looking at that from their perspective. After doing that, in looking at the sport of tennis, the ratios revealed would have been a 1:9 ratio for both men's and women's tennis, and were clearly out of kilter with the current 1:16-1:24 range already approved for individual/team sport field sizes.

We have also taken that a step further in questioning ourselves on the committee, wondering whether we are determining individual/team sports sizes in the proper manner. With consultation with the Management Council, we're also going to move forward with that study.

We're also committed to increasing access to both team and individual/team sports. We have a suggested position to follow later for the team sports and we'll continue to evaluate the individual/team sports and the method that is best suited for that selection.

Finally, the subcommittee recommended to the Championships Committee that we continue to monitor site selection. Part of last year's Convention presentation was the review of site selection and how that works. Numerous comments that we received back insinuated that we had some things we needed to discuss. So we also formed a subcommittee to evaluate the site selection process. That subcommittee is chaired by Suzanne Coffey of Bates College. Suzanne has done a wonderful job with that committee. They have given us a preliminary report. Their first duty will be compiling a handbook covering expectations in the bid process. As chair of the Championships Committee, it's my responsibility to make sure we continue to keep site selection within our sights.

This set of recommendations clearly shows the committee's position on key championships issues. It's the belief of the Championships Committee, and based on membership feedback, that the AQ process must maintain the issue of access and hold to its core

the values of equitable access and focus on in-season conference and regional competition. You will see later in the presentation that the committee's prioritized championships initiatives keep these original principles at the forefront.

Prior to talking about the future and the committee's list of initiatives, it's important to have a firm understanding of what the committee and the governance structure has done with the championships program over the past three years since AOs were implemented. The first slide shows 1999 to 2000. I would call your attention to the increases in individual/team sports. The team sport enhancements, a 1:7.5 ratio totaling \$266,000; the establishment of the women's golf championship at \$121,000 and mementos, standardizing the student-athletes' experience as much as possible from a memento standpoint at championship sites, totaling over \$200,000, for a grand total of \$815,000 during that year.

Moving on to 2000-01. I will call your attention to the increase in squad sizes and the focus on enhancing the student-athlete experience that totalled \$299,000, which made up a large portion of the \$316,000 that we spent in that year.

Moving to 2001-02. The establishment of two new championships, the women's ice hockey championship at \$82,000 and the women's rowing championship at \$257,000. In addition, there were minor additional expenditures that you can see for a grand total of 402 for that year.

In the end, the committee and the governance structure has recommended — the committee recommended and the governance structure accepted — over \$1.53 million to the championship structure since 1999. Almost 1.1 of that has been direct championships bracket enhancements, while a little bit over \$400,000 was allocated to various other line items, including student-athlete mementos and additional expenses.

Another thing to remember is that at one time overall funding for the championships at the Division III level accounted for over 90 percent of the budget. Recently, through the strategic plan and a commitment by the Presidents and Management Councils, the division distributed some additional money along with some initiatives that mirror the goals and targets of the division's strategic plan. In doing so, the overall expenses in the Division III budget spent on championships have decreased while the total amount of dollars dedicated to it has increased.

Now, for future plans and available resources I'll quickly run through what I'm going to cover in the next few minutes. The first, prioritized championships initiatives for 2002 through '04 and 2004-05 budget cycle and beyond; policy changes, short and long term; and a review of the Division III budget, the 2002 through '04 biannual period.

The committee has worked very hard on recommendations following the membership's feedback and formulated a clear, well-

thought-out list of 10 prioritized initiatives for the future. Before we make it quite that far, though, it's probably important we understand the financial requirement of the Division III championships program as a whole.

As many of you know, Division III championships were in a deficit of over \$750,000 in the fiscal year 2000-01. This is not the first time that the championships program has run in the red. In fact, three of the last four years has seen the championships program run at a deficit. Previous shortfalls that have been taken from the Division III reserve are made up through additional money left over from other programs. Judging from the recent budget history — I mean what happened last year and four years ago as well — it's very clear that we must first address the current shortfalls in the budget for the Division III championships prior to earmarking funds for future enhancements and other expenditures.

Therefore, the first initiative of the committee's list of 10 calls for base budget adjustments in the Division III championships budget. We're studying the numbers. There are sports in the program that have run six-figure deficits every year according to the study. Clearly, these are budget problems that need to be addressed immediately to try to avoid the type of deficits we have experienced in the past. This is allocated in the 2002-03 budget that you will see in a few minutes for a total of \$420,000. These funds were freed up by the task force to assist with necessary budget adjustments.

Secondly, we plan to handle selected sports committee recommendations, which total \$26,000. These include requests for additional officiating travel, necessary officiating travel and pay, and representatives to help run the men's golf championship, along with additional items.

Third, the committee is committed to establishing a contingency fund for Pools B and C. This fund will allow the committee the ability to fund additional teams in the bracket should a bracket find itself without bids in either pool, thus assuring the membership a minimum amount of access in both pools, with a total cost of around \$50,000.

Our prioritized initiatives for 2004-05 and beyond. We've proposed the establishment of a championships contingency fund to help cover shortfalls in the budget should an emergency arise, or other factors such as who gets in, how far they advance, and travel costs going through the roof that catch us off guard. It is only prudent financial responsibility to have a fund that will help cover overages should they arise. We're asking for \$100,000 to do this.

We recommend that the team sports brackets be enhanced to a 1:7.5 ratio. Currently, we have a range for team sports of 1:7.5 to 1:12. Therefore, in their sports, many individuals have not reached this goal. It is the belief that all team sports should obtain this bracket ratio prior to moving on with further enhancements. In addition, as there are new members and the moratorium expires, we will get new

members that will increase our numbers of participation in certain sports. This simply is asking us to allow to keep up with the pace, not lose ground with the new members that may be coming in.

I noted earlier that at its pre-Convention Council meeting, the Management Council continued to encourage the Championships Committee to emphasize the enhancement of individual/team sports and study the method in which we develop bracket sizes and participation numbers in those sports. We are also going to do this and are very excited about taking this task on.

That's right behind our team sport bracket enhancements of 1:7.5 as well. In addition, we're recognizing the membership's desire to see more at-large berths. We're recommending the team sport brackets be enhanced to 1:7. This enhancement will allow for more at-large berths while also providing equitable access to Pool B by lowering the ratio. Yes, it is true that there may be conferences that come into the Association or that form that may take a Pool C bid and move it to Pool A. But the committee stands committed to the emphasis on conference competition and would welcome new additions. The total for the divisional team sports enhancement to 1:7.0 would amount to an additional \$402,000.

We would like the division to provide participant awards to all student-athletes participating in Division III championships. Currently, Division I has adopted this policy and Division II is discussing it at this time and will make a decision soon. These awards are priced at \$10.50 apiece. The total cost to the membership would be \$125,000 to cover all eligible participants. Those would include individuals who did not receive an NCAA award, a team sport award or an individual sport award for a specific place.

We also ask per diem increase of individual/team sports for all days. Currently, the division is not spending a per diem on students who have completed their athletic championship. Just to give you an example, women's outdoor track, where a student-athlete is with the coach and the team, completes participation, and then has a choice. The coach has a choice. It's a liability choice, it's a safety issue for the student-athlete as to whether to send that student-athlete back on their own or to have them stay with the school and the school absorb those costs while they're still at the championship with the rest of the members of the team. The committee believes this should be extended to all sports affected by this rule with a total cost of \$900,000.

Last but not least, something I'm sure you're all concerned about, a general per diem increase of 60 to 65 and eventually \$70. Looking back, this committee committed the dollars from an increase of 60 to 65 through the original task force initiatives but asked for the money to be reallocated to championships bracket enhancements and adjustments. Clearly, \$60 in 2004-05 and beyond will not be worth what \$60 is today. We have heard arguments that the current amount is not sufficient at this time. We must pay attention to this and not let it get out of hand. The estimated cost of moving from 60 to 65 is

\$310,000, and moving from 65 to 70 would be an additional \$310,000. It should be made very clear, and you can see that these are a lot of big numbers passed before you in the last few minutes, that these are priorities earmarked for 2004-05 and beyond. There is no clear picture when they would be implemented.

In an effort to shore up the current issues facing the budget, the committee has recommended several policy changes, effective immediately, pending Management Council and Presidents Council approval. The first one, increase the mile radius from 400 to 500 miles for air travel. Currently, this is the policy in Division II. And Division I recently moved it from 300 to 400 miles. The committee has studied this and determined that it will provide significant savings. In fact, studying the 2000-01 budget year, we estimate savings of close to \$150,000. Therefore, we see a clear benefit given the current status of the championships budget.

Secondly, we must have better forecasting and planning of championships budgets. This is clear. Improved planning and study of current championships allocation is essential to correct the current problem in the championships budget. NCAA staff members are evaluating the current budget allocations and making adjustment within certain line items. Staff members will review season expenditures and maintain a better handle on the budget throughout the year without simply relying on a final figure to determine the health of the budget. In addition, committee staff liaisons will be asked to be more involved in monitoring their championships in anticipating increased expenditures from year to year.

Our policy changes for the long term. A 150-mile hub airport travel model. This policy change requires an institution eligible for air travel to a championship to use a hub airport if it is within 150 miles of a championship site. If there is a larger airport within that distance and the air fares are cheaper to fly into that destination, the NCAA will require the institution to fly into that airport and would provide appropriate ground transportation to and from the championship site. This policy also could require an institution to fly out of a major larger airport if one is located within 150 miles of their institution. This policy assures money savings. Worldtek would only require schools to use the larger airports if it was guaranteed to save money. A quick study of the 1998 cross country championship using this policy, focusing on both men's and women's championships, saved the division over \$56,000 in one weekend.

Earlier bid and host selection process. There must be better communication between the Championships Committee and individual sport committees to assure ample time in making hosting decisions. The committee has requested staff liaisons to extend the bid process out a few years so the sport committee, as well as the Championships Committee, have an opportunity to evaluate possible sites for cost implications. On recent occasions, the Championships Committee asked to approve sites in August that will be run or played in

November. This procedure clearly is not within the best interest of the process and places a tremendous amount of pressure on the committee to make an immediate decision.

It's also very important to note that there are occasions when we will receive a recommendation from a sport committee in which only one institution has bid the host. It's an effort on our part — it's going to be part of Suzanne's responsibility on her subcommittee and their task — to encourage the members of the membership to file bids. It makes it very difficult when you don't have another choice and you have a site selection that you know might cost you additional money but there's no other alternatives out there.

Finally, we're going to examine the number of predetermined sites and their locations. This echoes a little bit back to what I just referred to. Predetermined sites may cost the Association more money in championships. The committee will continue to study the predetermined sites and their locations and any direct effect these factors might have on the overall budget. If the sports continue to move in the direction of predetermined sites, the committee must do a better job of anticipating the costs of these sites. There definitely is a cost of hosting at specific sites and we need to try to determine that.

Knowing all of this, and hearing policy changes and all the things that we need to do, you think to yourself, "we're \$750,000 in the hole?" It's important to remember that you can control and establish policies to help alleviate and relieve pressure on the budget such as those mentioned, but you'll never be able to control some things that we can't control, one being travel costs. Last year, across all divisions, travel costs increased 25 to 30 percent. Thus, as a result, we had a little bit more of a deficit than we would have than when we're talking about a 25 percent increase. We also can't control who gets into the bracket and how far they advance and the travel concerns after that. So it's very important that all three of those factors, being travel costs, who gets in, and how far they advance, are major factors in the bottom line of the championships budget each year.

Moving on to a quick review of the 2002-04 NCAA budgets. Looking at the '02-'04 budget, there are three new pieces under championships. The first being a standard 5 percent inflationary increase of \$428,000. Each year the championships budget is increased by 5 percent in an effort to keep up with increased travel costs. The question has been raised that this increase might not be keeping up with the increased cost over the last few years.

Secondly, the \$420,000 base budget adjustment was reviewed earlier and the necessity of the division to accomplish this review and make the needed adjustments.

The third, and last initiative is a modest increase stemming from requests for necessary official fee increases as well as administration of championship events, totaling \$26,000. Moving on and looking at the right column, the 2003-04 budget, with the exception of a 5 percent increase that accounts for an additional \$528,000, there are no

other initiatives within the championships budget, thus totaling the end of 2003-04 year a total of championships expenditures of \$11.1 million.

It's the belief of the committee, as well as the Division III Budget Committee, that these initiatives, including the base budget adjustments, will help alleviate many of the budgeting woes we are suffering through now. We just don't know. We need time to do that, to sort through it and make sure we make the right corrections. The above increases account for an additional \$1.5 million over that two-year period.

The next slide indicates the state of the Division III reserve. As you can see, in the 2002-03 fiscal year, we're spending \$700,000 over revenue. In addition, \$395,000 will be spent over revenue in 2003-04. With the continued requirement of a 20 percent reserve, the division will be borrowing \$32,000 from the reserve in 2002-03 to cover the allocation and an additional \$629,000 in 2003-04. Once the next couple biannual budget periods are complete, and you heard a report this morning about the necessity to maintain the budget reserve to 15 percent over that period of time, it's not until we reach the 2006-08 budget where current projections indicate there might be significant enough excess to initiate some of the plan enhancements that I mentioned earlier.

Finally, we should be very clear on the committee's positions on the 2002 Convention proposals involving AQ principles and the possible creation of an additional men's Division III championship in the sport of volleyball. We recommend that Proposals 47 and 48 be referred to the committee for further study. In looking at both, the committee has recognized the need for additional access in Pool C and has already taken steps in that direction. The committee's changes obviously do not go as far as the recommendations in 47 but are by no means the last attempt by the Championships Committee to improve access for at-large participants in the championships bracket.

Under both 47 and 48, the committee has not taken a formal position of yes or no. We believe the proposals call for a clear shift in the basic tenets behind the original AQ principles. We would like to listen to debate on the floor and have an opportunity to evaluate the proposals on their merits, with feedback from the membership.

The overall evaluation of the AQ principles is a little over a year old, with continued work to be done. Considering a 2007 effective date for Proposal 47, we believe this may be a little premature. We would hate to see the membership box itself in and create a plan for Division III championships without further review. Further budget projections clearly do not allow us to move forward with any expansion in the championships program until 2006-08 at the earliest. Acting now on these principles would set into course a plan of action clearly ahead of time. Knowing how much the championships process has changed in the last four years in the implementation of AQs, we

would encourage additional review of these ideas within the Division III structure.

Proposals 49 and 50 request to establish a Division III men's volleyball championship as soon as possible, calling for a 2002 effective date. Currently, 41 institutions sponsor men's volleyball on the Division III level. While the approved number establishing a championship calls for sponsorship by 50 institutions, the Championships Committee supports the establishment of the championship as long as the Presidents and Management Councils' position on the current 50 schools is met. In addition, current budget restrictions do not allow implementation until the 2006-08 biannual budget period.

Summarizing very quickly, that's a tremendous amount of information you've tried to absorb in this short half hour, I'm sure. We've gotten wonderful feedback from the membership. The committee has been working hard, and I'm very proud of what they've done up to this point. They're looking forward to continuing to tackle these issues and move forward with AQ review. We must first shore up the current budget to make sure that from year to year we don't have a \$770,000 deficit each year. If we are, you and I both know you can't keep spending that much money.

We should also encourage discussion of 47 and 48. We do that. We ask that they be referred back to the committee to allow the Division III governance structure time to make a well-educated decision on the future direction of the Division III championships program. I thank you for your time this morning. I know lunch is right around the corner. I believe we've got a little bit of time for questions and answers. I'm not going to take the thunder away from my committee members. If they feel compelled to answer a question, I wish they would. So if you come to the mikes, we'll move forward with the question-and-answer period.

Mike Walsh (Washington and Lee University): I want to thank you for a very informative and thorough presentation. Earlier today Dr. Courtice delivered his "buck stops where" speech to us. He spoke of us, the members, as being the NCAA Division III. He acknowledged that we are a membership organization and that one of the common characteristics of the membership is frustration. In closing, he stated it is up to the Association to reflect our wishes.

Permit me to suggest that much of the frustration experienced by the membership is centered on one issue: national championships — particularly access to championships and the athletic quality of the hosts giving access to them. All member schools support educational initiative and benefit from them. We are in fact educational institutions. That is what we do. That is how we define ourselves. Athletics is but one part of the total educational enterprise that we offer. We look to the NCAA chiefly to provide framework for athletic programs and the conduct of championships. As we move forward, I urge the leadership groups of the NCAA to truly listen to the members on issues that the members deem most important to them: the access

and quality of play in NCAA championships. Thank you.

Sheila Wallace Kovalchik (Michigan Intercollegiate Athletic Association): I have two questions. When the original AQ procedure was developed, the 1:7.5 ratio was based on the average size of the Division III conferences. Has the committee looked at the current average size? It may not have changed. But I'm wondering if shift in conferences and new members, etc., has changed and if that may affect the size of Pool C on that basis.

My second question is one of the things I did not see, but I think the committee might be doing. Is the committee looking at the Division III philosophy on not just the predetermined sites, but whether or not those are neutral sites or whether they're back on actual campus sites?

Brad Bankston (Old Dominion Athletic Conference): To cover the first answer on the ratio issue, it's something we obviously have covered in the meeting but not probably as thoroughly as we may need to. But at this point in time, the ratio is determined after the additions or changes in numbers we have experienced in the last couple of years. So it's something that I think Chris might handle at our January meeting. I appreciate that.

The other issue on philosophy on neutral sites, that's something that Suzanne Coffey's group has discussed. Suzanne, do you want to elaborate on that at all? They have given us a preliminary report. I know that's something that's on there as they go through their deliberations.

Chuck Gordon (Emory University): I'd just like to point out that 47 has an effective date of 2007, which is an attempt to encourage the Championships Committee and certainly allow for input over the next five Conventions that would be held prior to anything in 47 taking effect. I think one of the problems we have with the group is something that you said earlier — there's no clear picture when any of these things would be implemented. I think 47 is merely an attempt to indicate a date when something should be implemented. It does not prohibit anybody from changing anything that's in 47. We have certainly changed things over the course of five Conventions.

I would hope that a Pool C enhancement, which would require something to be done by 2007 when the numbers we have project a surplus in Division III of approximately \$6 million that's continuing every current enhancement we still have, would seem to be a palatable suggestion for where we may want to find ourselves in 2007. Again, this does not come in until significant TV money kicks in, and encouraging and continuing all the enhancements we have, we would show a \$6 million surplus in 2007. We hope this would be a target that certainly could be moved or enhanced or changed over the next five Conventions.

Mr. Bankston: Chuck, thanks. I think there are several things there, one of which is we need some time to sort through the budget situation that we're in now since you called to our attention the effec-

tive date of 2007. The other would be the discussion that needs to be had from a committee standpoint of the switch or philosophy change, perhaps, in the tenets originally behind the AQ principles we had in front of us before. Obviously, there needs to be some discussion. Maybe we can hear something from the floor concerning that.

Tony Ladd (Wheaton College, Illinois): Brad, thanks to you and your committee. Is the committee willing to look at the broader philosophical issues of the ratio system itself that was put into place? In that discussion, how could it take place? By the general body of Division III? Are we restricted to working simply through the committee structure?

Mr. Bankston: I think this is a golden opportunity for you to express your opinion as to how you feel that the access ratios may be out of whack. I know I've received your letter. I'm sure many other people in the room have as well. We have to be very careful to get as much feedback as we can. That's my answer to you. That's what we're here to do today. Does that help?

Mr. Ladd: A little bit. My quick review of numerous Division III institutions would indicate there is a significant difference of opinion — I'll call it heartfelt. There is a significant question about financial ramifications of the policies the way they're now implemented. For instance, is the budget problem created by the automatic qualification system access? Or is the budget problem created by a lack of control on the part of the institutions or the committee that operates generally NCAA Division III? Or is it the sport committees? Why are we at this point of significant budget constraints that then is used from my point of view as a tool to prevent us to discuss the larger philosophical issues?

Mr. Bankston: I think the budget question that you raise is exactly why we need to have time to evaluate what we're doing. I've been told by staff there are issues ongoing now in the NCAA staff office where they're working toward a better way through their accounting system to govern this. Frankly, Tony, we're in a situation where we might have had little awareness along the way that we were running this type of deficit. Chris, if you want to elaborate a little bit more on what the staff is doing, I'd appreciate it.

Chris Pohl (NCAA Staff): We've discovered in this review that there are multiple factors converging at one point. There's more or less been some cumulative effect of the implementation of the AQ principles. We internally have a more sophisticated accounting system as a result of the move to Indianapolis that will help us highlight specific areas where we have overages that we might not have been able to detect before. That will allow us to do a better job of forecasting and assisting the committee with the decisions that they're making in terms of the budget ramifications. Whether it's the predetermined site selection process, not only the predetermined aspect of it, but the location of the championship.

So there are some things we believe we can get some control over.

Part of it has to do with asking for your help, especially in the site selection portion of it, making sure that the sports committees have options when they're selecting sites and making sure the Championships Committee has options when they're finalizing those sites. There are also some things that happen within the Division III championships budget of which there is little control that we can have. So there's the idea about having a contingency fund in place.

Some of those things Brad mentioned earlier but they have to be echoed. The related travel costs this year, an increase of 25 percent, is a significant increase in travel costs that we don't control. The other things that Brad has mentioned relates to who is selected to the championship and how far they advance and what that does on a transportation budget. There are multiple things that are occurring. We internally have sat down with the accounting staff to try to get a better handle on ways to identify areas in which we've gone over in order to assist the Championships Committee and the sports committees in this process. The second part of that is trying to build in a contingency fund into those areas in which we don't have control.

Mr. Ladd: Thank you, Chris.

Dick Kaiser (Defiance College): I have a point of clarification and a question. The consideration and the number of access opportunities for Pool C was one of the biggest issues in your group. We appreciate that. I have a question. If a team sport that is now currently using A, B and C as a method to choose the field, if a field grows and a conference gains enough teams to get an automatic berth in Pool A where they did not previously, does that now subtract from Pool C?

Mr. Bankston: That would subtract from Pool C. That's correct.

Al Bean (University of Southern Maine): If finances seem to be the major obstacle to expansion of Pool C, I think there's a couple of things to look at. First, I think the membership has spoken pretty clearly about access to championships, whether people agree or not. If we're saying nothing can happen until 2006 or 2007, one thing I would bring up is that every year when I pay my dues, I think 900 bucks is the best 900 bucks I spend. So 900 bucks now isn't what it was worth five years ago. It isn't what it will be five years from now. I think the membership would be willing — I'm speaking for the membership and I'm sorry (laughter). But the issue is we need help between now and 2006. We've been paying \$900 for a long time. I think it's at least worth considering.

Mr. Bankston: Al, thank you.

Ira Zeff (Nebraska Wesleyan University): I need a clarification on the previous question about Pool C. We may be losing a bid if a conference gains a separate member. Actually, we would lose from Pool B.

Mr. Bankston: It could be from Pool B as well, Ira. You're exactly right.

Mr. Zeff: That's what happened when the Northwest Conference

came in as well as, I think, the Southern Conference — I don't remember the name of the conference. But both of those took bids away from Pool B in both women's and men's basketball.

Mr. Bankston: That's exactly right, Ira. In addition, as members come in, the additional numbers that we may have may shape how conferences form and the bracket allocations as well.

Mike Vienna (Salisbury University): I have a comment and then a question. My comment is about the idea of regionalization and how we've created our regions. I've had concerns about that since we went into the AQ principle. I have changed my view about how we best could develop regions. I think that whole system has been flawed when institutions drive by a school that's two hours away that's out of their region to play somebody in their region who's six hours away. I think there's been a tremendous amount of gamesmanship with scheduling based on regions we have. I would recommend the committee take a strong look at doing away with regions entirely and look at the Division III record for championships. The teams that fly all over the country to get games will continue to do so and have been doing so because some will play their stronger competition outside of the region.

As far as the legislation next year, we have a Proposal No. 47 before us today. I, quite frankly, have not made up my mind how to vote on that. Your committee recommended that we refer it. You said there will be, if I heard you correctly, proposed legislation for next year. Is that in fact true? I would like to work through the committee structure, but I had hope that there would be some proposals by the committee for this Convention. I'd be curious as to where your committee stands for legislation next year and what that might look like.

Mr. Bankston: First, I'm going back to your regional statement. We've heard numerous things concerning regional alignment and how that's going to work. We want to let you know that we're going to have everything across the board coming in from sport committees, including your example of any Division III game they serve as a regional contest in, as well as the strength of scheduling index and any regional records when you first look at that for evaluation.

The second point is whether there will be legislation in 2003. We would make a commitment to take this feedback we hear on 47 and 48, as well as whatever we hear this afternoon. If it is referred back to the committee, we'll survey the membership on the current setup, the merits in 47 and 48 as well, as well as any philosophical concerns you have, and come back with regionalization in 2003 with some sort of a plan in front of you.

John Schael (Washington University, Missouri): Just taking a look at Proposal 47 and taking a look at the initiatives of the Championships Committee, I think they work in concert to be very honest with you, in that 47 gives you a definite date. During this next five years, the Championships Committee, without any increase in cost to them, has an opportunity to work out all the details. But I

believe that the membership is looking for a definitive date, something that we can hang our hat on. I think without question that the membership is going to work very closely with the Championships Committee. We are indeed one team. But I worry a little bit when we don't define what "long term" is from the Championships Committee. That concerns me a little bit when there's no clear indication in terms of when your initiatives will go into place.

Also, in terms of cost savings, I think if you ask the athletic directors, there are lots of places where we can cut costs. I can only speak to two right now — women's volleyball and men's basketball — because we have some experience with that. But in women's basketball, when we're required to stay at a national championship on a Saturday night, irregardless of whether we win or lose because it's championship money, why do we have to spend \$1,500 a ticket for a team member when I can go for \$400 because I have the Saturday night stay? I'm not going to leave before the championship game or Friday night's game. That's a significant amount of dollars that could be saved.

I would venture to say that if we could enhance the championships and if we can agree on a 2007 date to implement the new model, I don't think that we as athletic directors are real concerned about whether we get \$60 or \$65 on a per diem, which would be a savings of \$310,000 that you can put back in to your championship model. I certainly don't think we would be looking for another \$310,000 by going from \$65 to \$70.

We are interested in really providing a quality experience for the student-athletes. There's no question in my mind that this is of high interest to the student-athletes participating in all of our programs across the country. It's a privilege; it's a memory that will last a lifetime; and it's an experience that will never be forgotten. I hope that we can come together. We're not trying to take any of your thought away from what you're doing with the Championships Committee. We will work in concert with the Championship Committee for the benefit of the students. Thank you.

Gary Karner (Wisconsin Intercollegiate Athletic Conference): You and your committee have done a good job of laying out numbers and budget figures. That's important and good and we appreciate that. But you alluded to a little earlier about strength of scheduling issue and that type of thing. I know a gentleman made a comment alluding to it as well. Based on criteria and selection process and variances that are applied by different sports committees, when I talk to sport committees members, they talk about this particular committee thought it was more important than somebody else.

But right now, let's face it, there's a genuine disincentive in the way the selection process works in playing the best teams in your region. Has the committee explored that issue? You just mentioned strength-of-schedule factors. Has the committee talked about ways to encourage institutions to play the best competition within their

region? When you talk about cost, there's costs related that go on during the regular season, too. When conferences are putting football teams on planes, flying a thousand miles during the regular season because that's the only game they could get, we can talk about real numbers there.

I'd like for you to expand on that a little bit, if you could, as to what the committee has talked about in relation to that particular problem.

Mr. Bankston: Gary, as I mentioned earlier, in the feedback, that idea came from yourself in meeting as well as some other concerns expressed by the membership. We are in the process of gathering that information and felt the best place to go to determine the championship field would be the individual sport committees and ask them for their opinion one way or the other. We're hearing that selection in Pools B and C is difficult using regional criteria on a national selection basis. Anything we can do to help, I hear you. I understand what you're talking about and that's the type of feedback we need to hear.

Chuck Gordon (Emory University): I would home in on the travel side that we would work very closely with Worldtek. We've all heard the airlines are struggling to fill seats. We don't have a voucher deal with Worldtek that encourages us to lock in prices per seat. I would almost guarantee if we polled student-athletes on SAAC, the average ticket price is significantly more than the athletic directors' average ticket price because we bought ahead. They pay \$500 or \$600 for tickets. I'm paying \$121. We need to work hard to control the costs where we can. Worldtek is one of those areas.

We have 16 swimmers qualified for a championship in Miami. My ticket's \$180; I bought it the other day. I guarantee you when our swimmers get their tickets from Worldtek, they'll average about \$800. Those kinds of differences make Proposal 47 affordable if we just control costs. I would encourage us to make hay while there is hay to be made with the airlines. We need some kind of voucher arrangement to reduce travel costs.

Mr. Bankston: You can go a step further when you have a charter flight and the ability to have parents and guardians on that flight and be able to meet the commercial airlines fare to fill that flight up and return some money back to the division. We've also heard that concern. Thank you.

Seeing no one else at the microphones, I want to say thanks again. We're working very hard for you. We appreciate your comments. (Applause.)

Mr. Courtice: Thank you very much. I think the clarity and the decisiveness allows us all to have confidence in the committee's work. We will break for lunch. I want to remind you that we will reconvene shortly at 1 p.m. We're adjourned.

[Note: The delegates adjourned for lunch.]

Monday Afternoon

PROPOSED LEGISLATION

Joy Reighn (Rowan University): We're now ready to consider our proposed legislation. We will consider a total of 24 legislative proposals and related amendments. These are Proposal Nos. 40 through 63 in your Convention Notice and Program. We will vote on these proposals in numerical order as listed in Appendix A of your Convention Notice on Page 95. At this time, we usually make editorial revisions or corrections, but I'm pleased to announce that for the first time in the history of the NCAA, we have no revisions or corrections. (Applause.) Also, please note that the following proposals have been withdrawn: No. 46, No. 53 and No. 60.

Please remember that you will need both your voting paddle and electronic voting unit for any voting during our business session. Our procedures dictate that all voting be done by paddle or electronically rather than by voice or hand. Proposal Nos. 40 through 55 make up the Presidents Council grouping. We will begin with those proposals and conduct roll call electronic votes on any motion related to those proposals. That includes related amendments to amendments, motions to refer, as well as the motion to adopt.

Because we intend to use the wireless voting units today, I would like to make a few points about the system.

[Note: Electronic voting instructions were given.]

As we begin, I would like to remind you of one point of order. While I'm sure we will become familiar with many of you as the afternoon wears on, for the benefit of our court reporter, please state your name and institution when I recognize you at one of the microphones. We will now begin by considering Proposal No. 40.

Eligibility—Seasons of Competition

Lee Pelton (Willamette University): On behalf of the Presidents Council, I would like to move Proposal 40.

[The motion was seconded.]

For almost a century, this Association has grown and moved forward and addressed issues within a philosophy of amateurism, which has remained largely neglected. Our amateurism principle applies to student-athletes and their participation in intercollegiate athletics. Unfortunately, this has been expanded to include the pre-enrollment period without a specific criteria or rational principle being established to guide us.

The genesis for the legislative changes originated out of the Division III commitment to have less rather than more regulations. These proposals represent a reaffirmation of our amateurism rules and an effort to bring clarity, consistency and concern for student welfare to our current rules.

As you heard this morning, for the past two years, the Amateurism Task Force has explored the current state of our ama-

teurism rules in contemporary society. The task force engaged its membership in this important process. As you also know, the task force in fact amended the original proposals based on the feedback that it received from many of you here today. The next five proposals to be voted on represent our best work. We believe that these proposals will provide more equitable treatment for all Division III prospective student-athletes without abandoning the enduring values of our Division III philosophy.

Again, the proposals are in no way a retreat or an abandonment of pre-enrollment regulation, but rather represent a philosophical shift in regulation that's based on clarity, consistency and interest in student welfare. The proposals move away from the rather subjective analysis of determining intent to professionalize, which, as you heard this morning and as you know through your own experiences, renders prospective student-athletes permanently ineligible for acts and behaviors that yield no competitive advantage to establishing and acknowledging a prospective student-athlete's actual competitive experiences.

The seasons-of-competition rule is the first proposal put forward by the task force and represented by No. 40. It is the only proposal that is regulatory in nature and it is the cornerstone of all the proposals that will be voted on related to this important issue.

As a member of the Presidents Council and the Amateurism Task Force, I encourage you to adopt Proposal 40. Thank you.

John Cochrane (Iowa Intercollegiate Athletic Conference): Ladies and gentlemen, I come before you today to speak in opposition of this entire deregulation package consisting of Proposals 40 through 44.

The grouping of recommendations, I believe, threatens the very fabric of Division III athletics and everything it stands for. Last month, I was fairly specific in describing my concerns in an editorial in *The NCAA News*. I will not use this time to require you to sit through a repetition of those comments, although I do hope you analyze it. I also stand here not out of any disrespect for the governing committees in this division who support this legislation, but I have a passion for amateur athletics as embodied in this division and a genuine fear of what going down this road would do to our principles.

I believe the task force that initially brought forth these recommendations, although replete with bright and talented people, has misguided their efforts and are bent on just finally selling the deregulation for amateurism standards, not objectively evaluating the issue within the Division III philosophy. This is the same task force that initially recommended pay-for-play across the board. I commend the Presidents Council, who was in the very difficult position of having to wade through volumes of information, for having the foresight to at least eliminate that possibility for your consideration today.

However, now we're somehow dealing with a situation in which prize money is being treated significantly differently from salaried

compensation. Adoption of this package would leave us in a position of having to explain why we allow an individual who earns \$100,000 in prize money to continue to compete while rendering permanently ineligible an individual who earns \$500 in salary from a professional organization.

This set of proposals will inject an unprecedented level of professionalism into our athletic programs. The proponents of this package contend this is a student-athlete welfare issue for the benefit of a handful of student-athletes it may impact. I submit to you that the insertion of professional athletes in our athletic programs brings us ever closer to those environments too often seen in this Association where far too many decisions on a day-to-day basis are based not on the welfare of those student-athletes, but on the prospect of winning at any cost and the student-athlete is the financial bottom line.

In the last two years, if we as an Association would have spent half the amount of time and energy on educating the public as to what our standards are and providing feedback to those involved in the reinstatement process, as opposed to what we see as an enveloping and just foundation of relieving our amateurism standards, we would not even be engaged in this discussion right now. This Association has done a tremendous job of educating the public and our prospective student-athletes to the dangers of gambling, the use of performance-enhancing drugs, the use of tobacco products. But as important an issue as we're being told amateurism is, we have done a woefully inadequate job of educating prospects as to what our amateurism standards are. This is an obviously critical component in helping reduce the number of eligibility-impacting decisions couched in the ignorance of the rules.

The task force also would have us believe that there is a crisis in Division III related to amateurism. Where did this come from? There simply is no crisis. How many of you have been so overburdened on your campuses with amateurism issues involving your prospective students that you've been crying out for a fundamental change in our amateurism standards? I hasten to say very few, if any. That's because this package intends to address an average of less than 20 total student-athlete reinstatement requests per year involving amateurism in Division III.

Yet, based partly on those numbers, they're not just proposing to deregulate Bylaw 12 here. We have been discussing changes that would essentially render meaningless principle 2.9 of the NCAA Constitution, which requires that student-athletes shall be amateurs in an intercollegiate sport and that participation is motivated by education and other physical and social benefits to be derived, and that student-athletes should be protected from exploitation by professional and commercial enterprises.

Proposal 42 would allow an individual to compete on a professional team or in a professional league so long as they don't accept any compensation or have an agent. Not only does this fly in the face

of our fundamental principles, but how often do you think this will happen? It simply is not possible to compete on a professional team without becoming absorbed by the professional culture and atmosphere.

In addition, agents are almost prerequisites for professional team sports for a reason. Without them we're saying to 16-, 17- and 18-year-olds that you go negotiate your own terms of the contract, that you still need to sign to become an employee of this professional franchise or league. You make sure you understand your rights under the bylaws of collective bargaining agreements. Only then, provided you did not have anyone act as your agent during those discussions and you received no pay, unlike any of your teammates, could you some day come back and compete in Division III athletics. We talked about opening up a Pandora's box; this will do it. Agents are prolific for a reason in that arena. They'll continue to be there and it's unrealistic to think otherwise.

Division III has been on the forefront of deregulation for the past several years with many positive results. However, this movement threatens the very identity of this division and blurs the line of who we are beyond recognition. Ladies and gentlemen, let's not allow ourselves to be caught up in this whirlwind of commercialization. The win at all costs and bring-amateurism-down mentality have unfortunately been fairly pervasive throughout this Association right now. Our society has become virtually desensitized to the continuing warping of our values as they pertain to amateur athletics in this country. You can see it happening not only in our colleges and universities, but in our high schools, in our junior highs, even in our elementary schools in youth sports.

We have an opportunity here today to stem that tide, to take a position based on what is the right thing to do in looking at individual institutions and as a division. Let's send a message to our communities, to our faculty, to our alumni, that Division III is the only pure intercollegiate amateur sport in this country. I urge all of you to vote to defeat this entire deregulation package. Let's go back and do a better job of educating the public. Let's continue to provide our student-athletes with a very special and unique environment for athletic and individual development. Thank you very much.

John Harper (Bridgewater State College): On behalf of the Management Council, I would like to speak in support of Proposal No. 40. Division III is not a time warp. Time marches on and there are things that we need to do and changes we need to make in order to remain proactive for our prospective student-athletes.

As President Pelton mentioned, Proposal 40 is the only piece of the amateurism package that is regulatory in nature. The seasons-of-competition rule is, however, the cornerstone of the proposals. This proposal will address the period in time when the student-athlete has a break between the link of education and athletics. This will be essential to Division III.

Proposal No. 40 has two main components. First, the student-athletes will be charged with seasons of competition for every year they engage in organized competition after high-school graduation and prior to collegiate enrollment. The charging of seasons of competition will directly address any competitive advantage gained and foster a level playing field among member institutions.

The second component requires student-athletes engaged in organized competition to fulfill an academic year in residence. This piece ensures an appropriate commitment to academics, consistent with the Division III philosophy.

This proposal is all about our commitment to student-athlete welfare and education in changing times. It will more equitably treat all of our prospective student-athletes, while addressing competitive experiences in terms of their break in education. I might also add that if we fail to put this legislation into place, the crisis that may not necessarily take place now may in fact take place as a result of Division I and II student-athletes coming into our programs.

As the former chair of the Student-Athlete Reinstatement Committee and a current member of the Management Council and Amateurism Task Force, I strongly urge your support for Proposal 40. Thank you.

Gary Karner (Wisconsin Intercollegiate Athletic Conference): I also would like to speak in support of Proposal No. 40.

An important part of Proposal 40 is the definition of organized competition that has been created specific to this legislation. The intent of this rule is to address competitive experiences at high levels. Your local YMCA or church league is not intended to be caught in the definition and trigger the application of this rule. In that regard, the proposed definition generally will catch activities that would have been impermissible under our current rules and thus would render student-athletes ineligible for intercollegiate competition.

Keeping the specific definition in mind, the task force believes that the seasons-of-competition rule will treat student-athletes more equitably by addressing high levels of competition and fostering a more level playing field among our student-athletes.

Although it's been suggested that this type of thing is going to possibly create an influx of high-profile professional athletes, I would tend to rather support a something less than the sky-is-falling mentality relative to this and suggest to you that that is not a plain view of it. As a Division III commissioner and as a task force member, I strongly encourage your support for Proposal 40. Thank you.

Megan Stephens (State University College at Cortland): On behalf of the Division III Student-Athlete Advisory Committee, I urge your support of Proposal No. 40.

We believe that the adoption of this proposal will address two pending concerns. First, the loss of seasons of competition incurred will minimize any potential competitive advantage gained through the proposed deregulation. Second, the academic year in residence

illustrates a serious commitment to academics. Finally, we believe this proposal strikes a good balance in maintaining competitive equity while maintaining a serious commitment to academics that is paramount to Division III. Thank you.

Tom Weingartner (University of Chicago): On behalf of the task force, I would like to speak in support of Proposal 40. As the chair of the Amateurism Task Force and former member of the Student-Athlete Reinstatement Committee, I want to express my support for 40.

Proposal 40 is the first proposal to be considered today and the cornerstone for all the other amateurism proposals that we will consider. Proposal 40 sets the stage for other amateurism proposals that we will consider. It creates the necessary safety net to allow other areas to be deregulated without compromising Division III athletics. As a whole, the proposals this afternoon will move away from harsh penalties placed on prospective student-athletes for immature decisions without compromising the playing experience of our Division III student-athletes. The seasons-of-competition rule is the necessary step to ensure competitive equity and maintain focus on regulation prior to enrollment that most equitably treats all prospective student-athletes.

Parenthetically, I would say that the Student-Athlete Reinstatement Committee does not deal with prospective student-athletes who receive \$100,000 in prize money. What we do deal with over and over and have in the past are student-athletes 20 times a year who've made often immature and unwise decisions and are often forever declared ineligible for NCAA Division III competition. That is the crisis. We need to do what is right by those athletes who come to us for relief.

As the chair of the Amateurism Task Force, I encourage your support for Proposal 40 and all the proposals that will follow shortly. Thank you very much.

Stan Caine (Adrian College): I speak as a converted skeptic. I have a strong commitment to amateurism. I also have some understanding of the changing face of athletics in this country.

Last summer, I had the rare privilege of being able to sit down with the Amateurism Committee in Salt Lake City and state my concerns and engage in a dialogue over several hours about this legislation. I came away from that meeting with several impressions. The first was that this is an extremely able and hard-working committee that was extremely well directed by Tom Weingartner and that we need to be grateful for all of their good work. The second was that the task force understands very well the complexity of the issues with which all of us are trying to deal. The third and most important was that the task force, in my judgment, has crafted solutions that deal effectively with the primary issues of competitive advantage and the elusive boundaries that define amateurism these days.

In this regard, I was pleased in particular that as the discussion

took place over the last year or so, that they decided to drop the pay-for-play element because it was my judgment that that crossed the line and the task force agreed with that also.

On the basis of my great respect for the work of the task force and my satisfaction with the solutions that were developed, I support the amateurism package that's been developed.

[Proposal No. 40 was adopted, 291-46-4.]

Amateurism—Prize Money Based on Place-Finish

John Harper (Bridgewater State College): On behalf of the Presidents Council, Management Council and Amateurism Task Force, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 41.

[The motion was seconded.]

Currently, Division III prospective student-athletes are permitted to compete against professionals. The competition itself is permissible but accepting the prize money is not. The task force questioned why accepting the prize money is strictly prohibited.

During my time on the Student-Athlete Reinstatement Committee, we reviewed cases involving student-athletes who accepted small amounts of prize money in events prior to collegiate enrollment. They were declared ineligible by their institutions, and in order to gain back their eligibility status, the reinstatement condition was that they repay the prize money. How does repaying prize money earned in permissible competition equalize any advantage gained? The task force felt that it doesn't. Why then do we require repayment? It is certainly not in the best interest of the student-athlete.

The more appropriate way to address the competitive experiences in which our prospects engage is through the application of the seasons-of-competition rule, which we just adopted. The membership should be concerned with regulating competitive experiences prior to enrollment, not the specific prize money accepted. The student-athletes involved in these cases were not earning enough money to sustain their careers. If that were the case, they would not be seeking collegiate enrollment and Division III eligibility. Since the competition in which prize money can be earned is currently impermissible, our prospects are already engaging in this competition, and as evidenced by the reinstatement cases, some of our prospects are accepting this money.

This proposal is at the heart of student-athlete welfare, as evidenced by the strong support of the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee. I strongly urge the membership's support of this proposal. Thank you.

Stan Caine (Adrian College): On behalf of the Presidents Council, I wanted to speak in favor of Proposal 41.

The Presidents Council was initially concerned about allowing prospects to accept prize money. The task force, however, has educated us well concerning the need for this change. The present approach essentially asks prospects who accept prize money to earn back their

eligibility through repayment. The Presidents Council supports shifting the focus from the prize money to the underlying issue of competitive experiences. When engaging in competition that awards prize money prior to college enrollment yields a competitive advantage, the seasons-of-competition rule that we just adopted appropriately addresses that advantage; repaying the prize money does not. When we ask the question "What is best for the student-athlete?" repaying the prize money is not the best answer.

Tom Weingartner (University of Chicago): I would like to speak in support of Proposal 41. As John Harper did, I also served on the Student-Athlete Reinstatement Committee and was not able to justify repayment to buy back eligibility when the competition already was permissible under our rules.

The task force does not believe that allowing prize money prior to enrollment would change the dynamic of the Division III student-athlete body on our campuses. In fact, inasmuch as the competition is already permissible, the recruiting pool will not be altered. Instead, as evidenced by SAAC's support, Division III's amateurism rules will be more philosophically consistent and in the best interest of our student-athletes. I urge the membership to adopt this proposal. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 41 was adopted, 297-45-0.]

Amateurism—Competition With Professionals

Les Poolman (Dickinson College): On behalf of the Presidents Council, Management Council and Amateurism Task Force, I would like to move Proposal 42.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal 42 will allow prospective student-athletes to compete on a team with professionals. Currently, a disparity exists in our system. Current legislation allows competition against professionals but does not allow competition with professionals. Proposal 42 will address this disparity and allow prospective student-athletes to compete on teams with professionals.

It is important to note that the consequences of participating with professionals will not go unnoticed and will be addressed through the already adopted seasons-of-competition rule. By adopting Proposal 40, Division III has addressed the competitive advantages that the prospective student-athletes may have received by playing on a team with professionals. Specifically, the individual will be charged with a season of competition for every year of competition that he or she engages in at the professional level and be required to sit an academic year in residence.

I encourage your support of Proposal 42. Thank you.

John Harper (Bridgewater State College): On behalf of the Management Council, I would like to speak in support of Proposal 42.

Under current legislation, competition against professionals is permissible while competition with professionals is not. As a result,

participants in individual sports are able to compete at a professional level and still maintain their amateur status while team sport participants cannot. For example, although it is permissible for a prospective student-athlete to compete in a tennis match against a professional athlete, it is not permissible for a prospective student-athlete to compete on a professional soccer team.

After careful analysis, the task force believes that the seasons-of-competition proposal already adopted will more equitably treat prospective student-athletes. Further, the task force believes that at times it is difficult to determine if a team is professional under NCAA legislation. This proposal would make this determination moot and only require institutions to determine if the seasons-of-competition rule was triggered.

I encourage your support of Proposal 42. Thank you.

Tom Weingartner (University of Chicago): On behalf of the Amateurism Task Force, I would also like to speak in support of 42. I just wanted to note that also allowing competition with professionals does not allow for the student-athletes to obtain agents or to accept a salary. These activities still remain impermissible and would result in a violation of NCAA legislation. Proposal 42 simply serves as a way to help those student-athletes who have competed on a team with professionals and did not accept a salary to compete at the Division III level and obtain an education. Therefore, the task force believes that these proposals are in the best interest of prospective student-athletes and do not compromise the Division III philosophy. I encourage your support of 42. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 42 was adopted, 298-49-1.]

Amateurism—Contractual Agreement

Chris Walker (University of Redlands): On behalf of the Presidents Council, Management Council and Amateurism Task Force, I would like to move Proposal 43.

[The motion was seconded.]

I just completed my term as chair of the Student-Athlete Reinstatement Committee and have seen multiple cases involving the true failed professional. Let me start with an explanation of the "intent to professionalize" standard that currently is used by the reinstatement committee and staff to analyze cases involving contractual agreements.

The current amateurism analysis focuses on an individual's intent. Therefore, the act of signing a contract shows clear intent to professionalize and results in permanent ineligibility. I've heard actual cases during appeal calls and witnessed firsthand the injustice permanent ineligibility results in for uninformed prospective student-athletes. Listening to these cases, I have realized that these individuals often are exactly the types of student-athletes who we want in our Division III athletics programs. Uninformed and immature decisions have resulted in their permanent ineligibility. But

these individuals epitomize the concept of a failed professional and should be permitted to compete in Division III athletics.

I encourage your support of Proposal 46. Thank you.

John Galgano (Manhattanville College): On behalf of the Division III Student-Athlete Advisory Committee, I urge your support of Proposal No. 43.

Under current legislation a prospective student-athlete who signs a professional contract permanently loses eligibility in that sport. Signing a professional contract does not give a prospective student-athlete a competitive advantage. Proposal 43 will provide a prospective student-athlete the opportunity to retain eligibility. Furthermore, since accepting a salary is still considered as an advantage, this helps the true failed professional. As a baseball student-athlete, I would welcome a failed professional who made a bad decision, learned from it and then made the choice to be a Division III student-athlete. We strongly urge you to support Proposal No. 43. Thank you.

Tom Weingartner (University of Chicago): I would also like to speak in support of Proposal 43. We believe it is in the best interest of prospective student-athletes. The issue of contractual agreements is one that the reinstatement committee has always struggled with. Realistically, the student-athletes who we are discussing here today are not those student-athletes who have made legitimate attempts at the NBA or the NFL, but rather are individuals who have made uninformed, unwise decisions resulting in permanent ineligibility in Division III.

These student-athletes are truly the failed professional or, as Lee said earlier, the failed amateur. Their actions have not resulted in competitive advantage inasmuch as the simple act of signing a contract in and of itself does not create a competitive advantage. Unfortunately, the current legislation results in harsh penalties for actions that result in no real competitive advantage, such as signing a contract, while failing to address adequately actions that do yield a competitive advantage. By adopting this proposal and Proposal No. 40, the seasons-of-competition rule, prospective student-athlete welfare will be enhanced and actual competitive experiences will be addressed. I encourage your support.

Bette Landman (Arcadia University): On behalf of the Presidents Council, I would like to speak also in favor of Proposal 43.

The Presidents Council has worked diligently to become better educated on the topic of contractual agreements in order to ensure that we are doing what is in the real best interest of student-athletes. It's important to note that the majority of Division III prospective student-athletes who signed these agreements are not receiving any monetary compensation. Further, under the amateurism proposals, the acceptance of money from a professional organization will continue to result in the prospective student-athlete being declared ineligible to compete, thereby eliminating any potential abuses of the leg-

isolation.

The Presidents Council has discussed several reinstatement cases and concluded that these student-athletes should be eligible. They are failed amateurs. They're not really professionals who didn't make it. They have made poor, immature decisions, have not received professional compensation and are showing a commitment to education. We should embrace this commitment and welcome these student-athletes.

I encourage your support of Proposal 43. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 43 was adopted, 310-42-0.]

Amateurism—Professional Draft

Les Poolman (Dickinson College): On behalf of the Presidents Council, Management Council and Amateurism Task Force, I would like to move Proposal 44.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal 44 would allow prospective student-athletes to enter the professional draft and be drafted without compromising their NCAA eligibility. The simple act of placing one's name on a draft list does not in and of itself create any competitive advantage for the involved prospective student-athlete. Similar to the proposal to deregulate the signing of a contract, the act of placing your name in the draft shows a clear intent to professionalize and thus currently results in permanent ineligibility. The task force believes that the act of placing one's name in the draft should be permissible inasmuch as this act does not result in any competitive advantage gained.

If a prospect engages in competition as a result of being drafted, the seasons-of-competition rule would be triggered. The task force believes that this is a more equitable way to treat prospective student-athletes.

Finally, I want to reemphasize that the use of an agent or the acceptance of a salary still remains impermissible. Thus, this proposal only allows a prospective student-athlete to engage in the draft process.

I encourage your support for Proposal 44.

Bette Landman (Arcadia University): On behalf of the Presidents Council, I would like to speak in support of Proposal 44.

The Amateurism Task Force has continuously updated the Presidents Council about its work and has in fact amended proposals based on our suggestions and feedback. In that regard, the Presidents Council believes the task force has become the experts on this issue and we support their recommendations.

With regard to Proposal 44, our current standard of "intent to professionalize" seems too harsh. Merely entering your name in a draft does not necessarily result in a competitive advantage gained and thus should not result in permanent ineligibility. It does not appear that deregulating the draft legislation will in any way compromise the Division III philosophy and it will enhance our commit-

ment to student-athlete welfare. I encourage your support.

Arleigh Dodson (Northwest Conference): I did not hear the chair say in this proposal that Item (e) is moot. We already voted on it. This removes subsequently; therefore, we would reverse it if we support this. In No. 44, (e) competes on any professional athletics team. And in number 42, (e) says "subsequent to initial full-time collegiate enrollment, competes on any," etc.

Dan Dutcher (NCAA Staff): The point of clarification is that Proposal 44, the relevant section identified, has in fact been amended by your actions to adopt Proposal 42. It's a good clarification. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 44 was adopted, 307-26-4.]

Membership—Provisional Membership

Donna Ledwin (New Jersey Athletic Conference): On behalf of the Division III Membership Committee, Presidents Council and Management Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 45.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal greatly enhances the Division III provisional membership process. All three divisions currently are in the second year of a two-year membership moratorium. During the moratorium, each division has thoroughly examined its provisional membership process. For Division III, this means some dramatic changes to the current process. I will focus on three key changes contained in this proposal.

The first key issue is the required exploratory period. Schools wishing to join Division III will be required to complete a one-year exploratory period prior to applying for provisional membership. This period will permit each school the time necessary to make an informed decision to join Division III. During this year, interested schools will receive information regarding the entire provisional membership process so each school will know exactly what to expect once the process begins.

The second key issue is the requirement that interested schools must meet the fundamental provisions of Division III membership—the prohibition on athletically related financial aid and compliance with the five sports per gender sports sponsorship requirement. If a school wishes to join the division, it should demonstrate its ability to meet Division III requirements such as these fundamental requirements. Schools must demonstrate a commitment to meeting these requirements before they can apply for provisional membership.

The third key issue is an annual limit on the number of professional members that will be accepted each year. The committee greatly enhanced the professional education process by creating more in-person, face-to-face meetings between provisional members, the NCAA staff and the Membership Committee. This was done in response to the feedback from our 26 current provisional members who asked for more education and communication.

However, with the increased level of education and involvement comes implementation. It is not practical to provide such a high level of services to a large number of schools. Thus, after reviewing the number of schools currently in the process and the support necessary to provide this education, the committee agreed that six was an appropriate number to accept each year. The selection of which six schools will begin the process will be made via a random selection process to ensure that all schools are treated fairly.

This proposal will assist Division III in planning for further membership growth in a way that provides minimal disruption to services, programs, championship opportunities and other benefits currently available to Division III active and provisional members.

For these reasons, I urge your support of this proposal. Thank you.

Tom Bohlson (Heartland Collegiate Athletic Conference): We move to divide Proposal 45 by separating two items from part B. The first item is 3.6.3.2, application, dealing with the first two sentences regarding the addition of a one-year exploratory period. The second item is 3.6.3.4, election, limiting the size of annual class of provisional members to a maximum of six schools.

Ms. Reighn: We have a motion to divide. Is there a second?

[The motion was seconded.]

This motion is a nondebatable motion and needs to be carried by a simple majority. Therefore, we will use our electronic units to vote. A "yes" vote on this proposal would be to remove the one-year exploratory period and a limit to six institutions for separate consideration. Any questions on that? Vote one, yes, you're voting to divide. If you're voting two, you're voting not to divide it out, and three is an abstain. Please cast your votes.

[The motion to divide was defeated, 109-208-12.]

Sheila Wallace Kovalchik (Michigan Intercollegiate Athletic Association): On behalf of the Michigan Intercollegiate Athletic Association, I move the adoption of Proposals 45 and 45-1.

[The motion was seconded.]

The MIAA chose to propose this amendment because we've been working with a prospective member school for an extensive period of time in anticipation of the moratorium being lifted. Proposal 45 is before us as a new method for the selection of provisional members. There is no way to anticipate the inclusion or random selection process, nor the exploratory year for educational purposes. The MIAA believes this educational component is an important element and in fact has already initiated an extensive educational program with the prospective member involving presidents, faculty representatives, financial aid officers and athletics directors.

The amendment we are now proposing is a technical amendment designed to close the gap in the process and recognize an oversight involving one institution and one Division III conference that are caught in the wheels of change and were moving forward long before

the concept of a random selection process and exploratory year were proposed. This is an intelligent solution because presently there is no NCAA provision to deal with the situation. At the present time, there is no mechanism for an appeal process. We ask you to support this amendment.

Ms. Reighn: Just a reminder that we are now focusing on the merits of Proposal 45-1. Are there any other comments on the amendment to the amendment?

Kevin LaGree (Simpson College): I'm a member of the Presidents Council.

During our meeting yesterday, the Presidents Council agreed to support this legislation. This proposal will only affect one school and one conference. While one could view this as a special interest legislation, the Council concluded that the proposal represents a fair and appropriate way to treat a unique situation. At the same time, the proposal's stringent terms will not open the door to an endless succession of future waiver requests from other schools that could undermine our membership process. Thank you.

Donna Ledwin (New Jersey Athletic Conference): With all due respect to my colleagues from the Michigan Intercollegiate Athletic Association, I would urge you to defeat Proposal 45-1.

As you know, from articles in *The NCAA News*, the Division III newsletter and pre-Convention mailing, the Membership Committee was given a charge: to come up with a system of managing the future growth of the division and to enhance the provisional membership process itself. To come up with such a process that is both fair and effective was no easy task for that committee. Proposal 45 serves the best interest of the full membership of Division III. Some institutions, and in this case conferences, may be unhappy with the limitations. But granting exceptions only serves to support the principle of fairness to all who have been waiting at the door.

Proposal 45-1 grants a special privilege to a particular institution simply because it is affiliated with a conference with no similar proviso for independent institutions, creating an immediate and inherent unfairness in the process. Any conference that offered membership to a nonmember institution based on what they anticipated the new membership process to be did so at their own risk. Passing legislation that benefits just one institution and one conference is simply poor legislative practice.

Further, there is no guarantee that all conferences can provide the level of education that the Membership Committee, Management Council and Presidents Council have all deemed necessary for the program to be successful. In order for the provisional member process to be both equitable and effective for all, I ask you to defeat Proposal 45-1.

Dennis Collins (North Coast Athletic Conference): Madam Chair, we've had a good discussion about this amendment in our conference. It is clear that the MIAA has operated in good faith and has

been diligent over the course of several years in working with the potential new member. Through a combination of events and a change in the procedures, they have found themselves in a real "Catch 22" on this issue. We would ask the membership to consider this legitimate amendment of our sister conference in the Great Lakes area.

John Van Iwaarden (Hope College): We're a member of the Michigan Intercollegiate Athletic Association. I come to you as a faculty member, hoping to convince you that the passage of this amendment is a fair and equitable act. This amendment will be a significant benefit to eight member schools of the NCAA, and that is a basic tenet of our organization. All members of the MIAA will benefit from having a philosophically compatible institution join us. The benefit gives us an opportunity to make an intelligent exception at the beginning of a new process, that being the lifting of the moratorium and creation of a new set of rules.

The new member of our conference for whom we are proposing this exception has worked for a number of years to prepare for NCAA membership. There has been an opportunity window for other colleagues and other institutions to follow our proposed process. We have found no other conference having similar aspirations and conditions. The passage of this amendment will not disadvantage other institutions; it is not unjust to others. As some new process for provisional membership takes effect, we decided to fix an exception at the beginning of the process, a tweaking of the rules to allow a special case to be accommodated.

Our new conference member is caught in a clink in a potential new process. They have already done the exploration. They are continuing to receive significant new-member education from our conference. They bring a full complement of sports to our conference. We would like to afford them a fair and equitable resolution of their desire for NCAA membership. Please join me in supporting Amendment 45-1.

Page Remillard (Agnes Scott College): I have been asked to speak in opposition of this proposal on behalf of the Independent Institutions Group, which includes many current provisional members.

We are strong supporters and recognize the real value of the exploratory year as designed in Proposal 45. The enhanced process also earns our support that the fairness of a lottery selection and fiscal responsibility of limiting provisional class size, though the number six was debated on if it was too low, is something that we strongly support. The Independent Institutions Group opposes this legislation due to the inequity should 45-1 be approved and represents to current full and provisional independent institutions 45-1 may appear to be special interest legislation for one school and one conference, as already mentioned.

The Division III membership moratorium continues to be in place

to this date. The Independent Institutions Group believes the policies and procedures for new membership should apply to all future members. The Independent Institutions Group strongly urges your defeat of this proposal.

Lou Barone (Baldwin-Wallace College): I'm going to accept the arguments of the MIAA. The world will not end if we pass this piece of legislation. We are not going to collapse the Association. I'm willing to buy the arguments and I'm willing to support a one-time basis.

Chris Bledsoe (New York University): A few weeks back, I went to Times Square in New York City and got in a very long line to buy tickets to Mel Brooks' smash hit on Broadway, *The Producers*. After two or three hours in that line, I was in sight of the ticket window when a gentleman steps in front of me, in a polite New York kind of way. I asked him what he thought he was doing. By way of explanation, he handed me a letter that said he had friends who already had tickets to the show and were inside waiting for him. In a polite New York kind of way, I told him to go to the back of the line. I suggest that you defeat Proposal 45-1. (Laughter.)

Marvin Zuidema (Calvin College): That was a great way to end it. At the same time, I can't leave it like that. Because there is a point here. The point is good faith, good intent on the rules that now exist is the essence. That's what's been happening for the last two years. It's happened that a school, an institution and a conference, has made good faith and good action with our present rules and regulations. Frankly, we don't know from where these new regulations are going to come. With that in mind, I'm going to really urge you to vote "yes" on this simply because it is a matter of good faith and proaction on the part of what we're considering. Thank you for your consideration.

Dan Calandro (Knox College): I could use a little more information. Could somebody clarify how many other institutions there are in this waiting line? Were any of them or all of them as far along in the process as this institution is supposedly along? Maybe that's not a question that can be answered, but is this institution heads above the other ones that expressed interest in coming into the NCAA Division III or are they comparable to the others?

Dan Dutcher (NCAA Staff): That's a good question. I don't think we can answer it. To reemphasize, only one institution meets the requirements of this legislation. I don't think we're able at this point to let you know how the other institutions who have expressed interest in joining the division may compare on a variety of fronts to the provisional school membership. I don't think we can answer that question at this point.

John Van Iwaarden (Hope College): In partial answer to that question, the school that has already been accepted into our conference has done a multiple-year exploratory already. They are very, very well acquainted with all the rules and regulations of the NCAA. We also have done an extensive conference education program for

this school. So we believe that they are in fact a long ways into the pipeline. That's why we urge a resolution of this at this time.

Page Remillard (Agnes Scott College): Just a brief rebuttal on behalf of the Independent Institutions Group. To say that one has been operating in good faith I think is quite probably accurate. But to suggest that the independent institutions who assume the moratorium meant moratorium were not acting in good faith—not to say that but to suggest that there were others who did not also act in good faith, or to assume that—would be inaccurate. Many of us were operating that the moratorium was going to continue until a stated date and at that time there would be opportunities for everybody to move. So we again urge that this be defeated.

Ms. Reighn: We are now ready to vote on 45-1. This will be a roll call vote.

[Proposal No. 45-1 was defeated, 117-218-8.]

Dan DiBiasio (Wilmington College): On behalf of the Division III Presidents Council, I encourage you to adopt Proposal 45, a proposal that provides for planned and managed growth for our division.

Based on the number of schools that have expressed an interest in joining Division III, it is possible that the Division III membership total could reach 450 by the start of the 2011-12 academic year. This estimate is based on the adoption of Proposal 45 with an annual limit of six schools per year. Without that limit, it is possible that Division III could have annual provisional member classes of as many as 20 or more institutions. These numbers are overwhelming. Such growth would surely have a significant adverse impact on everything Division III does, including championship access ratios.

It is clear to the Presidents Council that the growth of Division III needs to be managed in a way that minimizes the impact on the division as a whole. This proposal helps accomplish that. For these reasons, I urge you to support this proposal. Thank you.

Chris Bledsoe (New York University): On behalf of the Division III Management Council, I urge you to support the adoption of Proposal 45.

This proposal will assist Division III in planning for further membership growth in a way that provides minimal disruption to the services, programs, championship opportunities and other benefits currently available to Division III active and provisional members.

Since the 1990-91 academic year, Division III has grown from 331 active and provisional members to 422 during the 2001-02 academic year. In the last 23 years, the division has grown by 141 members. Division III now makes up over 40 percent of the NCAA membership. Continued growth of this magnitude will greatly impact all aspects of Division III. This proposal helps manage and limit the impact of growth by ensuring that provisional members are committed and prepared to join the division. It permits the governance structure to plan education programs accurately through the annual limit of six schools per provisional class. It's imperative to the NCAA and

Division III that future growth occurs in an orderly and manageable way. This proposal is a giant step forward in effectively managing the continued growth of the division. I urge your support. Thank you.

Sheila Wallace Kovalchik (Michigan Intercollegiate Athletic Association): We have an uncanny interest in this proposal. I have two questions. My first question is just a clarification. If a non-NCAA member conference, perhaps with five members, wishes to join, do they go into the proposed lottery as one or as five individuals?

Ms. Reign: We're going to ask Chris Martin to speak to that, Sheila.

Chris Martin (NCAA Staff): Good question, Sheila. At this point, the Membership Committee would take them as individuals. There's not a difference between conferences and institutions.

Ms. Wallace Kovalchik: The second element of my question: What happens if Proposal 45 is defeated? I have to ask the "what if." Obviously, this would have been discussed at some point. Is the moratorium extended indefinitely? Or is it better for us to play the odds?

Dan Dutcher (NCAA Staff): It's hard to answer that hypothetical, but a couple of facts. In October, the NCAA's Executive Committee reviewed the status of the moratorium. Based upon the proposed provisional member education program for Division III that's contained in Proposal 45, and a similar education program that was adopted in Division II this morning, as well as related efforts in Division I, the Executive Committee directed each division governance structure to consider legislation to move to eliminate the moratorium effective May 1. Should Proposal 45 be defeated, clearly the Division III governance structure would have to reevaluate the status of that recommendation and respond back to the Executive Committee in that new context.

Gary Karner (Wisconsin Intercollegiate Athletic Conference): There seems to be something troubling at least to me about determining if an institution's future status in this organization is by chance.

Was there serious discussion relative to other types of criteria that could be developed, as opposed to some sort of — and I know this may be facetious — picking names out of a hat when you're looking at the future status of an institution as to their membership in this organization? I understand the issue of the potential influx of institutions. It would seem to me that a lot of the other elements of this proposal would probably curtail, at least to a certain degree, some of that influx. Also, the point of this is being driven by more a staffing concern when you set the number at six. I'm hearing that.

Were there alternatives that were explored relative to the educational process? There are a lot of people out in the membership, quite frankly, who can provide educational information just as adequately as a significant number of NCAA staff members could do. The MIAA is a current example of that. To me, it probably could have been done

a lot cheaper than sending NCAA staff members around the country. I know there's a couple of questions picked up there at once, so hopefully you can provide some clarification.

Ms. Reign: Thanks, Gary. We're going to ask someone from the Membership Committee, since the first part of your question was directed to that committee.

Donna Ledwin (New Jersey Athletic Conference): Gary, I'll try to answer each part of your question, if I can remember them all. First, your question about leaving it to chance. I think that's a little bit of an exaggeration because it's really not a matter of chance. It's not a matter of if; it's a matter of when. If you meet the criteria, it's a matter of when. I don't think anybody has to sit around and wonder if they're going to get in if they meet the criteria; the only question is when.

We did give a lot of thought to the education process and the fact that the number was limited. To provide the high level of service in a consistent way, hearing it from the membership office staff, I don't think we ever did honestly give serious consideration to farming it out to other conference offices or other folks in the membership because we wanted a consistent, accurate education process. I think we felt that that was best handled through the national office staff.

I think I missed a question in there somewhere.

Mr. Karner: I understand your point now but the fact that when and if is still left up to chance. I think that's an inescapable conclusion. Ultimately, you may get in but it may be two or three years down the road depending on if your name is selected out of the hat. Again, depending on where you are in the process, that could be a significant delay.

Ms. Ledwin: I think that the committee deliberated on this and felt that if we are going to fulfill our charge of managing the growth, which we have been told is a very big concern, as well as providing a highly personalized level of service, that the number would have to be limited in some way.

John Harvey (Carnegie Mellon University): I agreed with the last couple of speakers. Gary I think is correct. Donna's position is good that we need to manage the growth, I believe. Whether the number is six or eight or whatever, I think management of the growth is good. However, I am also concerned about specifically that point of random selection. In principle, of course, that sounds like the most equitable way to do it. However, I think a lot of intelligence and a lot of good information can be allied to considering the potential members that are lined up, and I especially think of geography.

In all of our committee appointments and in many, many other aspects of things we do in Division III at least, we're concerned about the geographical balance of our membership and so forth. While I understand it may mean waiting in line a few more years, I think that considering the brackets in championships and the various aspects in which geography enters into this, I really believe that some

review of the idea of simply random selection ought to be taken. That strikes me as being, in a sense, too equitable. I think we've got to think of various factors that could help the Association in deciding which six or eight members should be selected each year.

Ms. Ledwin: John, if I could just respond. Dan, correct me if I'm wrong, but the committee felt that as long as the basic criteria — we did think about things like what if we have a dearth of certain members in a certain geographic area of the country — wouldn't we want to perhaps provide a higher number of members there? But I really think you get into questionable legal waters when it goes to more subjective matters, more subjective criteria. I think we felt that, after reviewing it with legal counsel, that this was certainly safer legal ground to be on for that reason.

[Proposal No. 45 was adopted, 273-62-5.]

Executive Regulations—Selection of Teams and Individuals For Championships

Dick Rasmussen (University Athletic Association): On behalf of the University Athletic Association, I move Proposal 47.

[The motion was seconded.]

You have in your Convention Notice the rationale that we provide for this proposal. Several weeks ago, we also mailed to every athletic director and conference commissioner in the division a briefing paper that described in some detail the application and potential effects of this proposal as well as the costs associated with it. Our rationale statement begins by stating a fair selection to the championships pools is dependent upon two oftentimes competing principles: access to the championships and the competitor quality of the championships pools.

Within the current selection process, access is provided by the automatic qualification of conference champions, Pool A, and also by the allocations that are set aside for independent institutions and those who do not qualify, Pool B. The competitive quality of the field tends to be ensured through the addition of other teams that are not included in Pools A and B, which is, of course, Pool C.

When this selection process was adopted in 1999, it was clear to many that the lack of allocations in Pool C was going to be a problem. This morning, it was made very clear from our experience over the last several years with this championship process and with the feedback from our membership that the principal problem with the current championship selection process is the lack of allocated berths in Pool C.

Proposal 47 addresses this problem directly. The mechanics of how it's applied are provided in the rationale statement and we've provided examples in our briefing paper. Briefly, it's a three-step process. The first step being the determination of the initial field size. Our examples use a 1:8 base ratio. The second step sets aside 50 percent of those berths for at-large teams, which are Pool B and Pool C

allocations. The last step adds to the field to accommodate the automatic qualifying champions that exceed 50 percent of the field.

The results are that Proposal 47 preserves automatic qualification and doesn't affect Pool A. It preserves Pool B. There is no diminishing effect on Pool B. It significantly enhances, though, the allocation of berths in Pool C. Other proposals described this morning sound so simple, but the manipulation of the access ratios to a 1:7.0 ratio do not go nearly as far and, in our opinion, do not go far enough.

The total cost of implementing this proposal by the effective date of 2007 is estimated to be approximately \$656,000. The method of determining this was the same method used by the NCAA staff and governing committees when they do their similar projections. The information provided this morning clearly shows that this proposal is affordable and can be financially implemented by 2007. Further, our briefing paper and the information this morning demonstrated that this can be done without affecting adversely the allocations for Division III initiatives currently in the budget and without violating the Presidents Council guidelines on requirements regarding the Division III budgetary reserves.

One thing that was suggested this morning was that this proposal would tie the hands of the Championships Committee. We do not feel that this is true. Rather than tying the hands of the Championships Committee, the adoption of Proposal 47 can actually serve to advance their efforts and make their efforts easier. The proposal creates a specific and reasonable implementation time line, one that we can adapt and incorporate necessary adjustments between now and 2007.

In summary, we feel this is significant to the student-athlete welfare issue. It involves a clearly identified and clearly resolvable problem. It provides considerate and effective resolution of the problem. It is affordable and it is responsible and I believe should be enacted now. I urge your support and thank you for listening.

Ira Zeff (Nebraska Wesleyan University): On behalf of the Independent Institutions Group, I would like to speak against Proposal No. 47. Although we believe access to championships is vital to the principle of access and to have true enhancement of championships, it is critical that we rely on the Championships Committee to determine how this is accomplished. The Championships Committee has a true understanding of the philosophy and guiding principles regarding access to national championships. We feel it is essential that we allow them to complete their charge of reviewing the championships and making the appropriate adjustments. The Independent Institutions Group opposes Proposal No. 47. Thank you.

Brad Bankston (Old Dominion Athletic Conference): On behalf of the Presidents Council, Management Council and Championships Committee, I move that Proposal No. 47 be referred to the Championships Committee.

Ms. Reighn: We have a motion to refer Proposal 47 to the

Championships Committee. Do we have a second?

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. Bankston: As presented this morning, the AQ principles adopted in '99 by the membership were implemented during the last two years. As directed by the governance structure, no substantive changes occurred during that two-year implementation period. Discussion this year has focused on feedback gathered regarding the impact of AQ on the championships program, possible revisions to AQ and related championships enhancements.

The majority of feedback received by the Championships Committee indicates that the membership supports the core principles related to AQ but that changes in bracket sizes to afford minimal, and perhaps even greater than minimal opportunities in Pool C at-large berths are desirable. The committee also learned that the membership favors the modification of team selection criteria to continue emphasis on regional play but broaden how regions are defined.

In response to this membership feedback, the committee has outlined plans, both short- and long-term, to address those common themes, while maintaining the underlying philosophical basis of the current AQ formula. The plans also reflect available resources.

Proposal 47 appears to represent a philosophical shift from the current AQ principles. Based on feedback, the committee believes that as a whole, the membership supports the current principles with moderate, as opposed to substantive, modifications. The shift in philosophical approach between championships enhancement based on the current AQ principles, as contemplated by the committee and Proposal 47, seems to be a matter of degree.

If this proposal is referred, the committee will review the 2002 Convention proceedings on this topic and (1) discuss the development of a questionnaire that will compare and contrast the current AQ model with the committee's recommended enhancements as well as Proposal 47; (2) survey the membership on its position relative to the two philosophical positions; and (3) share the results with the membership in legislative form at the 2003 Convention.

The committee therefore recommends that Proposal 47 be referred back to the Championships Committee for further consideration as part of its ongoing evaluation of AQ, consistent with the process outlined above. This morning's discussions were very profitable for the Championships Committee to hear concerns and issues from the membership prior to our continued review of the AQ principles. Thank you.

Ms. Reighn: Let me make a few comments on parliamentary issues. The vote to refer requires a simple majority for adoption. Any discussion should address the referring, not the merits of the underlying proposal. Because Proposal 47 will be done as an electronic roll call, the referral will also be done by electronic roll call.

Michael Raymond (Western New England College): On behalf of the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee, I support the referral of

Proposal No. 47 to the Championships Committee.

The Championships Committee is currently in the process of reviewing automatic qualification. We heard from the committee this morning and just moments ago, and Mr. Bankston made it very clear, that we should provide student-athletes with as many opportunities as possible. This is always a welcome concept to the student-athletes themselves, who strive to participate in and compete for national championships.

Proposal 47 directly relates to the current and future tasks of the Championships Committee and it makes the most sense that they fully review any proposals or ideas currently undertaken. Proposal No. 47, while a valid one in principle, should be referred to the Championships Committee for further review. Thank you.

Chuck Gordon (Emory University): All I would ask is that the membership realize the passage of 47 in no way prohibits anything being done or discussed by the Championships Committee. They can go ahead with surveys, go ahead with straw votes. We hope they would do so. Forty-seven by no means is the answer to expansion for everyone in this room. Our conference has its feet in both Pool B and Pool C in some cases. We understand there will be modifications. That's why the date is five Conventions away.

Regardless of whether 47 passes or not, we would hope that you would not refer, that you would put 47 into effect and allow five years' worth of fine-tuning by the committee. We've all been here before when we've been told legislation is coming, and that it's going to be appropriate. I would only refer you to the financial aid audit model when we were told something was coming down the road to take care of it. We now have a mandatory audit with no way to do it. I think the procedures can follow. The committee can study, and take five years to modify it. But in effect, if nothing else happens, at least 47 is in effect. I would encourage you not to refer, vote 47 up or down.

Les Poolman (Dickinson College): On behalf of the Division III President and Management Councils, I speak to support the recommendation that Proposal No. 47 be referred to the Championships Committee.

In 1999, the Presidents Council proposed and the membership voted to adopt automatic qualification legislation to give greater emphasis to conference and regional competition in team-sport championships. These goals were and remain consistent with the Division III philosophy statement.

The current automatic qualification legislation places the highest value on equitable access for all team-sport student-athletes. Proposal No. 47 could alter the balance of equitable access in favor of competitive equity. Such a fundamental shift requires careful consideration. We should not rush into such a change. Rather, we should follow the deliberative review process outlined by the Championships Committee this morning.

The proposal implementation date for Proposal 47 is more than

five years away. Clearly, there is ample time to further review this significant proposal, develop alternatives, outline key differences and gather specific feedback from the membership prior to setting our championships course for the foreseeable future. We should exercise caution before we substantially shift our current philosophy of championships access.

On behalf of the Management and Presidents Council, I recommend that Proposal 47 be referred back to the Championships Committee for further study as part of its continuing review. Thank you.

Bette Landman (Arcadia University): I would like to speak in favor of the motion to be referred on behalf of the Presidents Council and the Budget Committee.

This proposal is and has potential to be a significant big-ticket item. The sponsor admits that it will cost upwards of \$650,000, which really isn't cheap. However, the final figure is likely to be significantly more.

First, the cost estimates do not include our two newest championships, women's ice hockey and rowing, nor does it include those likely to be added between now and the year 2007.

Second, the estimate does not account for the true cost of the current championships programs in the remaining team sports. The sad reality is that we are not at present paying for our current championships program. This is a situation that, frankly, was not fully discovered until about November of this year, until we were well into our current fiscal year. We discovered that last year, as you heard this morning, we had a deficit of well over \$700,000. So we do not know exactly what the deficit may be this year because many of the championships are already played under the old rules.

It has become clear that we need to revise the championships budgets to reflect reality. That is the reason for the \$420,000 adjustment, to take a look at this. Unfortunately, we really don't know if this \$420,000 will correct the situation. We need to make sure, therefore, that this particular proposal is put in line with all of the other items that were outlined this morning under championships as other areas that we wish to devote some of our funds.

In the mind of the Budget Committee and the Presidents Council, it makes more sense to be sure we are fully funding our current championships program before we commit to a large-scale championships enhancement. For these reasons, I encourage you to support the motion to refer Proposal 47. Thank you.

Peter Smith (Wesleyan College, Georgia): I had the opportunity to serve on a swimming and diving awards committee a few years ago and was given the task to come up with a selection procedure that was nowhere near perfect. But we at least felt we got the best people to the event. I think in Dr. Tom Courtice's words, and we've heard throughout this weekend, current issues include student-athlete welfare.

Many of us went to the awards dinner last night. Many of the characteristics of the awards banquet was national experience. That gave them a door to NCAA awards, postgraduate efforts and all-American selection. Many opportunities opened to those individuals who went to nationals.

I think we can strike a balance between regional representation and the quality of the fields we expect of the NCAAs. I believe that Proposal 47 is the first step for giving the selection procedure the ability to raise some issues very applicable to the selection process in championships and the student welfare access. This issue is not one of conferences, of independents or of attitudes toward sponsors. This is about student-athlete welfare at the national level. I ask that we do not refer this to the Championships Committee. Thank you.

Dick Rasmussen (University Athletic Association): I'd like to take very strong exception to a couple of statements made in the past few minutes. The first one has to do with the suggestion that this proposal represents a shift in philosophy. It does not. This proposal honors the philosophy of fairness and provision of access to championships that is engendered in the selection of or access of conference champions to the championship pool. It retains that. It does not affect that.

It honors the principle of providing and setting aside access for independent institutions in the same ratio that was embodied in the proposals adopted in 1999. I know that. I was a member of the Management Council when those proposals were put forward. It extends that philosophy by providing fair opportunities for student-athletes who have demonstrated that their qualifications are the same as those others that have been set aside and demonstrates that on-the-field play provides access for them. If that's a change of philosophy, I suggest that's a change that should be adopted sooner rather than later.

The second exception I'd like to take, and this is with all due respect to the governance structure and the Championships Committee, because I know they've worked hard and I know they have a very difficult task in front of them. But to move and ask for input and look forward to good, vigorous discussion of this issue, to move to refer this proposal to the committee cuts off that sort of discussion. Because the discussion now has to be focused on the move to refer and not on the substance of the proposal itself. That suggests to me some question as to how valued or how genuinely sought input is from the membership. I would urge people to speak to the proposal as best they can.

A couple of other points. With regard to the effective date of 2007, our proposal originally had a proposed effective date several years earlier. In discussing this with the NCAA staff, it was suggested and we accepted the suggestion to move upward and provide the Championships Committee more flexibility and adequate time to fully address the issues around implementation. That's why it's out

there. That's something necessary. If this proposal is delayed another year or two years, it's going to push that out even further.

Finally, in terms of the effect on budget and so on, there are a lot of unknowns. I really do think it's clear there are funds and resources available in the budget. As was suggested this morning and in our briefing paper, there are means of funding that come from outside. There are budgetary allocations that could be explored as well. Thank you.

Ms. Reighn: Dick, I appreciate your comments. At the time of the referral, there was no one else at the microphones.

We are now ready to vote on the motion to refer Proposal No. 47 to the Championships Committee.

[The motion to refer Proposal 47 to the Championships Committee was adopted, 228-112-2.]

Resolution—Review of Championships

Tony Ladd (Wheaton College, Illinois): On behalf of the sponsors in Illinois and Wisconsin and numerous other institutions, I move Proposition No. 48.

[The motion was seconded.]

The purpose of this resolution is to mandate the development of legislation for the 2003 Convention that will address concerns related to the conduct of championships. Proposition 48 provides guidance for a focused review in an appropriate time frame. In short, it is a win-win situation for all of us. The resolution empowers the leadership of our division to continue their efforts and frames the review so that the championship package will be examined in its entirety, not simply in parts. It gives those of us in the trenches confidence that the end result will produce proposals that address and acknowledge weaknesses in the current system and provides remedies that can help us move forward as an organization. I urge support for Proposition 48.

Brad Bankston (Old Dominion Athletic Conference): On behalf of the Presidents Council, Management Council and Championships Committee, I move to refer Proposal No. 48 to the Championships Committee.

[The motion was seconded.]

This resolution potentially alters the current philosophy of equitable championships access for conferences and independent institutions inherent in our AQ principles and legislation.

On behalf of the Championships Committee, I request that you refer Proposal No. 48 back to the Championships Committee as it continues to review the current system, address concerns expressed by the membership and develop proposed revisions to AQ during 2002 for membership consideration, if necessary, at next year's Convention.

Ms. Reighn: The motion to refer is debatable. It takes a simple majority and all comments should refer to the referral.

John Schael (Washington University, Missouri): I urge you to not refer this back to the Championships Committee. I'm just questioning right now why we come to an NCAA Convention. There's tremendous participation, but we're referring all the important issues back to the Championships Committee. Do we have input as to what's taking place in our own national organization? Or are we just constantly referring it after working as independents as professional members? We're trying to voice our opinion here.

We'd like to be able to discuss the issues. I hope you don't refer it back to the committee.

Dan DiBiasio (Wilmington College, Ohio): As a member of the Division III Presidents Council, I support the motion to refer Proposal No. 48 to the Championships Committee.

Adopting this proposal before the Championships Committee has an opportunity to do its work and fully explore all possible modifications to the existing AQ principles would be premature. Feedback from the membership indicates there continues to be support for the core elements of the AQ principles. The goal of the committee's modifications will be to address the membership's stated concerns, while not abandoning the core values innate in the current AQ legislation. I urge you to refer Proposal No. 48.

Tony Ladd (Wheaton College, Illinois): There is really nothing in the Proposition 48 resolution that would undermine either the work of the committee or the philosophical principles identified in the AQ legislation. What this would simply do is provide us a carrot to work through the system so that we would know that the intense effort to complete the review could be done in a concerted effort this year. This is timely legislation that needs to be passed so that we can move forward in anticipation of addressing these issues.

Dick Kaiser (Defiance College): I stand up and speak against referring and it's because most of you have spent hours talking to your administrators, your coaches and your conferences about how you want to vote. You know how you want to vote. To refer it back is ridiculous. We are hereto make a vote. Don't keep pushing things back. We're going to see it again. If you have an opinion, let's make a vote.

Chuck Gordon (Emory University): This may be the first time in 21 years that a resolution is being referred. I don't remember any. I remember a lot of straw votes and a lot of crazy stuff, but I don't know that we've ever referred a resolution before.

Clearly, we were told when AQ passed that we didn't need to do anything for two years. That was four years ago. We tried to work through legislation. This has passed. If in fact it's the aim of the Presidents Council, the Management Council and the Championships Committee to not listen to the membership and only have us to address what they wish us address, someone should say that.

This is a critical issue that I think to allow a number of confer-

ences, at least in this case, and it's not our conference sponsoring this, a review of championships to be pretty innocuous. Referring to the committee a resolution that just asks that people look at things and bring forth something that we've all decided today is important to us is just amazing to me.

Dee Fairchild (Grinnell College): As a member of the Division III Championships Committee and Management Council, I support the motion to refer Proposal No. 48 to the Championships Committee.

This proposal should be referred to the committee for consideration as part of the committee's ongoing review of the championships program and the AQ principles. Adoption of the proposal could indirectly limit the full usage of options available to the committee for AQ revisions. This might prove inconsistent with the championships philosophy adopted by the membership three years ago and consistently supported by subsequent membership feedback.

On behalf of the Management Council and Championships Committee, I urge you to refer Proposal No. 48 back to the Championships Committee. Thank you.

Jerry Chaplin (Messiah College): I appreciate what the Championships Committee presented to us this morning. I appreciate their hard work. I also appreciated hearing twice today that there was going to be legislation presented by that committee at this Convention a year from now. I don't understand why there would be a reason to refer at this point.

We're all in athletics here. Every game I've been at there's been one winner, there's been one loser. This is an opportunity for all of us to be a winner. For it to be referred, I think we would all come out as a major loser on this legislation. I urge that we defeat referring 48.

Tom Weingartner (University of Chicago): I'm wondering if someone who's spoke in opposition to this can explain to the membership specifically how this might be in opposition to our current championships philosophy.

Brad Bankston (Old Dominion Athletic Conference): Tom, I guess I'll direct comment to your question. The concern from the committee was to have some discussion on these issues and hear some feedback from the membership at this time. There's specific pieces through the Championship Committee's review that we look at. The issue of the discrepancies and philosophy and conduct of the tournaments, including the recommendation regarding the current ratio system for bracket allocations, indicated to us a potential shift in the philosophy of the A, B and C. That is the reason why we came forward with the referral. Obviously, we wanted to take this under consideration with the committee during our deliberations.

Tom Weingartner (University of Chicago): Despite the response, I'm just not understanding what is contradicting the principles of fair access and student welfare expressed in this resolution. Those are the philosophical tenets I see described here. I'm not sure

that these contradict our existing philosophical approach to championships.

Ms. Reign: We're now ready to vote on the proposal to refer Proposal No. 48 to the Championships Committee.

[The motion to refer Proposal No. 48 to the Championships Committee was defeated, 126-211-2.]

We're now ready to resume debate on Proposal No. 48. Is there further discussion? Hearing none, we are now ready to vote on Proposal No. 48.

[Proposal No. 48 was adopted.]

Championships—Minimum Number of Institutions— Exceptions—Men's Volleyball

Zak Ivkovic (City University of New York Athletic Conference): On behalf of the City University of New York Athletic Conference, I move to accept Proposal No. 49.

[The motion was seconded.]

In the spirit of gender equity, we ask this body to approve the proposal to establish a Division III men's volleyball championship with a minimum of 40 institutions, something this body has supported in the past for emerging sports. Proposal 49 confirms an equal playing field for male and female student-athletes and invites member institutions to enact gender equity in the spirit of enhancement, not exclusion, and promote the growth of the sport for Division III.

Proposal 49 has the added consideration that the university is missioned to educate families, opens its door to a majority of minority students, including a large number playing high-school volleyball who are seeking continued education and compete on the collegiate level.

Our voice carries 20 years of fostering volleyball championship history for women and the past 15 years for our men. In practical terms, the establishment of the Division III men's volleyball championship will level the playing field for male volleyball competitors, who are currently required to compete against Division I athletes. Proposal 49 not only gives student-athletes the opportunity to level the playing field and compete against their peers for their own national championship, it will constitute concrete enactment of the spirit of gender equity.

On behalf of the 200,000 students and the City University of New York, I urge your support for this proposal. Thank you.

Mike Ricciardi (North Eastern Collegiate Volleyball Association): In the current situation with multidivisional championships, only nine of the 42 Division III teams have access to get to the Final Four men's volleyball championship. The other 33, because they're competing under the Division III philosophy of playing like institutions, do not have the access.

Also, of the current 80-plus schools overall, half of them are Division III institutions that have no shot at all for a national cham-

pionship. As referred to by the access stated next year, it would be 42 Division III teams that would be full-member NCAA schools, and with asking for that, 40 would be within that realm. We would ask that they support this on behalf of CUNY, on behalf of NECVA, and on behalf of Division III volleyball. Thank you.

Bette Landman (Arcadia University): As a member of the Division III Presidents Council, I speak in opposition to Proposition 49.

While reduction of the minimum number of institutions needed to sponsor a sport in order to establish a divisional championship has occurred in the past, reduction targeted emerging women's sports in order to stimulate growth, provide greater participation opportunities for Division III female student-athletes and support gender equity

Accelerating growth, except in areas that complement other priorities, does not reflect the membership's priorities and may compromise the appropriate allocation of available resources to existing programs.

On behalf of the Presidents Council and the Management Council, I recommend opposition to Proposal 49.

Mr. Ricciardi: With all due respect, from the comments that were made earlier today from the Championships Committee and budget problems, even if this were put down and we needed to wait for 50 teams, it appears that nothing would happen until 2006-07. So with that in mind, I would ask that we support this piece of legislation. Thank you.

Connee Zotos (Drew University): As a member of the Division III Management Council, I speak in opposition of Proposal No. 49. The Presidents Council and the Management Council are concerned with the reduction of the minimum number of institutions needed to sponsor a sport in order to establish a divisional championship. The current legislation for how a championship is established has provided adequate growth in the championships program. It has been at a prescribed rate and has been consistent with the membership's sponsorship priorities. Modifying the formula in a sport not identified on the emerging sport list does not appropriately reflect the membership's priorities.

Further, men's volleyball already is experiencing significant growth in sports sponsorship and likely will reach the 50-school threshold soon. In that regard, this proposal appears to be unnecessary.

On behalf of Presidents Council, Management Council and Championships Committee, I recommend opposition of Proposal No. 49.

Mr. Ivkovic: With all due respect, the men's volleyball players don't know what list they're on. They want to have an opportunity to compete. That's all Division III student-athletes want, an opportunity to compete. I heard a student-athlete SAAC member say before

that that's what Division III is about — giving them an opportunity to compete. If that's what it's all about, then it doesn't matter what list they are or are not on. It's about giving them a chance, giving them an opportunity to compete for a Division III national championship. That is all that we want. Thank you.

Ms. Reighn: Just a reminder to the delegates, you are limited to two trips to the microphone to speak on a particular issue unless it is to answer a question. Are there any other discussions? Seeing none, we are now ready to vote on Proposal 49.

[Proposal No. 49 was defeated, 78-237-19.]

Playing and Practice Seasons—Scrimmage

Steve Argo (Southern Collegiate Athletic Conference): On behalf of the Interpretations and Legislation Committee, Presidents Council and Management Council, I move the adoption of Proposal 51.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal will standardize the number of scrimmage opportunities available to all Division III sports by permitting each Division III sport the opportunity to participate in one exempt scrimmage contest/date of competition during the preseason practice period of the traditional segment. The contest/date of competition must be conducted in privacy and no class time is missed. These additional conditions prevent an institution from participating in an additional regular game or date of competition.

This issue originated with the Division III Student-Athlete Advisory Committee as the SAAC noted the current inequity of scrimmage opportunities for Division III sports. This proposal will provide scrimmage opportunities to 19 sports while only two sports will lose current scrimmage opportunities. The Interpretations and Legislations Committee has worked hard in the past to create equal opportunities for all sports. This proposal is another example of the committee's efforts.

For this reason, I urge you to support this proposal. Thank you.

John Schael (Washington University, Missouri): We talk about equitable opportunities and you're looking at No. 51. Well, I wonder where all the equitable opportunities are. All sports don't have non-traditional seasons. Not all sports have opportunities for a number of nontraditional games related to their particular sport. There's no nontraditional season for football. So why all of a sudden make it equitable across the board when over the years we have worked hard to identify those things that were important to particular sports? We passed the legislation, and we gave those young men and young women opportunity in their own sport. So I urge the defeat of No. 51.

Chuck Gordon (Emory University): I have two problems with this. It takes away scrimmage from soccer. We shorten the soccer season, and we've cut back the number of games already over the years. I don't think it's a great burden to play another scrimmage. Most of these are within the community. We're not missing anything, we're

not traveling, we're not spending anything overnight.

The second problem I have with this is the definition of missed class time. Perhaps I can get an interpretation from Dan. If I have a lab on Monday and I reschedule that lab and take the same lab on Wednesday, have I in fact missed the class on Monday? I'm cautious about the definition of missed class time. I think our student-athletes do a great job of trying to make up work or do the same work at a different time. I would not like to be precluded from participating in scrimmages because of missed class time when in fact the classes are made up. So I have a question about missed class time. I don't see a definition in the book that addresses this issue. That's why with the inclusion of the wording of missed class time, we will not vote for this.

Ray Gilbert (Worcester Polytechnic Institute): A point of clarification. If this proposal passes, does it allow preseason scrimmages as long as the total number of games of scrimmages does not exceed the maximum number of dates or contests?

Chris Martin (NCAA Staff): As the intent in the proposal indicates, this would be an exempted scrimmage contest or date of competition. Hypothetically, if you had 17 contests, you could have 17 in this one since this is exempted.

Dee Fairchild (Grinnell College): On behalf of the Management Council, I speak in support of Proposal No. 51. This proposal is about fairness. This proposal is also about providing equal scrimmage opportunities to all Division III sports.

Currently, inequities exist. Some sports such as basketball have two exempted scrimmages, while baseball, for example, has no exempted scrimmage opportunities. The sport of soccer has an opportunity to play up to three scrimmages/exhibition games prior to the first permissible contest, but such games must count against the maximum contest limitations. This proposal eliminates the current inequity by providing all Division III sports an opportunity to participate in an exempted scrimmage opportunity during the preseason practice period during the traditional segment.

For these reasons, I urge your support for this proposal. Thank you.

John Galaris (Salem State College): I'd like to echo the comments of my colleague from Washington University. We've spent a lot of time over the years determining which sports should have scrimmages and which should not. The proposition that we're trying to level the playing field for all our sports is nonsense, because we do have nontraditional seasons in some sports, we don't have them in others. To suppose that by allowing everybody one season would level things is just not acceptable because it's not accurate. I urge you to defeat Proposition 51.

Ray Gilbert (Worcester Polytechnic Institute): The example I was trying to get an answer to would be in the case of soccer. If we exempt one scrimmage, can you have other preseason scrimmages as long as the total number of scrimmages and games does not go over

the maximum?

Chris Martin (NCAA Staff): Hopefully, I can answer your question this time. For example, if you took advantage of this legislation that was adopted, you could have a scrimmage that would be exempt from counting against the maximum number. But if you participated in another scrimmage, that would have to count against your maximum number of contests. Hopefully, that clarifies it for you.

John Galgano (Manhattanville College): As it stands right now, there are two sports that have exempted scrimmages and 19 sports that do not. This proposal would allow 19 sports to gain an exempted scrimmage and only take one away from soccer and basketball. So in the name of equity among all student-athletes, SAAC supports this proposal.

Joyce Wong (Eastern Connecticut State University): I have two questions on this proposal. How are we differentiating in which sports we count a date of competition versus a scrimmage? Do we allow the date of competition for all sports, which would allow the sport of basketball or another sport to participate with three or four different schools that we allow other sports to continue to do when we say date of competition?

The other question is are we also including football in this and allowing a preseason scrimmage in football?

Mr. Martin: Football would be included in this proposal. They would be permitted one exempt scrimmage during the preseason practice period. That's your second question.

Your first question related to contest or date of competition. That is really defined by the sport. Basketball is a contact sport. Field hockey, for example, is a date-of-competition sport. The legislation is drafted so it would cover both as it's defined by the sport. So field hockey would have one exempt date of competition. Basketball would have one exempted contest.

Let me clarify one thing to make sure people understand. We already define in Bylaw 17 which sports are contests and which sports are date-of-competition sports.

Joyce Wong (Eastern Connecticut State University): It really is not fair to those sports that we say it's one competition or one individual school in those sports that we allow to say that you can have your scrimmage as a date of competition. Because those sports such as field hockey with a date of competition can invite three or four different schools on one day and play all day.

Mr. Martin: To answer your question, yes, that would be the next date of competition where you could participate with four institutions or three institutions playing against each other and exempt that as the scrimmage date of competition.

Chuck Gordon (Emory University): I'm trying to get an answer to my question about missed class time.

Dan Dutcher (NCAA Staff): Chuck, we don't have a definition or interpretation of missed class time related to this proposal at this

point.

Mr. Gordon: Then I would suggest to the membership that the fact that we don't have a definition of part of the resolution is reason enough to vote it down. Because what's going to happen is what we've done before. We're going to pass something, we're going to figure the interpretation is going to be one way, it's going to come back another. Someone's going to miss Psych 101, they're going to make up Psych 101. For the purposes of this, it's going to be defined as missing class time and we're all going to be in trouble. Unless we know what we're voting on, I think we ought to be very, very careful given the past history.

Dick Kaiser (Defiance College): In joining with Joyce, if the intent of this rule is to provide equity for all sports, you did not and will not do that as long as you have a difference of competition and dates of competition. Where volleyball could have six or seven or three or four competitions in one day and only count that as one would not happen for other sports. You have not created an equitable situation, which is what everybody's saying this is about.

Bill Klika (Fairleigh Dickinson University, Madison): Just a question, and it may be a wording question. Right now, football, using that as an example, has 10 games and a scrimmage. It's in the book. Are we now saying adding an exempted scrimmage to that? Okay. I think some people are looking at that possibility for all those sports.

Mr. Martin (NCAA Staff): Hopefully, I can clarify your question and some of the confusion. Taking the football example, you do have 10 games and a scrimmage. This proposal would create an exempted scrimmage and remove the other scrimmage opportunity you currently have. Again, the intent is to allow every sport an exempted scrimmage opportunity. As we mentioned, not all sports have it. So in that particular case, 10 games and exempted scrimmage. Hopefully, that clarifies.

Dan Harris (Milwaukee School of Engineering): We're still confused about Chris' answer to the soccer question. Are we in fact losing a scrimmage in soccer or are we gaining one?

Mr. Martin: Soccer does have somewhat new legislation right now. This exempted scrimmage would replace what it currently has. Soccer would have one opportunity, similar to the football example that was just raised a minute ago.

Mr. Harris: Okay. Right now, there's two opportunities within a 20-game limit. So you would have one opportunity within the 20-game limit, or one opportunity within a 21-game limit?

Mr. Martin: Hopefully, I can clarify. Soccer does have the three scrimmage opportunities prior to the first contest that would count against the maximum. So right now, we do have in a sense three opportunities. This would replace those three so your soccer would be losing two scrimmage opportunities.

Mr. Harris: And a total of 20 dates. So in other words, soccer, if you wanted to play 20 dates, you'd play 19 countable contests and one

scrimmage or 20 contests and one scrimmage?

Mr. Martin: Twenty plus one.

Mr. Harris: Thank you.

[Proposal No. 51 was defeated, 151-182-6.]

Playing and Practice Seasons—Football Nontraditional Segment

Donna Ledwin (New Jersey Athletic Conference): On behalf of the New Jersey Athletic Conference, I would like to move Proposal No. 54.

[The motion was seconded.]

Ms. Ledwin: At this time I would like to move Proposal 54-1.

[The motion was seconded.]

When the members of the New Jersey Athletic Conference were floating the concept of Proposal 54 to their colleagues around the country, the feedback we received was encouraging. However, there was concern expressed that leaving the number of practice opportunities unspecified made people nervous. The feedback was that football student-athletes would be in the weight room six days a week including weekends.

Therefore, we offered this amendment to meet those concerns and ensure that our football players had ample time for class work and whatever else their lives might entail after their competition season had ended. While we believe that each institution is responsible for placing reasonable limits on its students and coaching staff members, we offer this amendment as insurance that athletics will not trump academics, even in the nontraditional season, for our football student-athletes.

Leon Lunder (Carleton College): On behalf of the Division III Management and Presidents Councils, I urge you to defeat Proposal No. 54-1. While the Councils recognize the intent of this proposal, they do not support it. The rationale statement speaks to the inability of the sport of football to get all 21 permitted weeks by the legislation. Many Division III sports could make the same claim. The Management Council has asked the Playing and Practice Season Subcommittee to review this issue across the board. Regardless of that issue, the impact on multiple sport student-athletes, institutional facilities and institutional staff members are significant reasons to not support this amendment. I urge you to defeat this proposal. Thanks.

Chris Walker (University of Redlands): On behalf of the Division III Management Council and Presidents Council, I urge you to defeat Proposal 54-1.

This amendment could further impact the academic endeavors of a large number of student-athletes. With this amendment, football student-athletes would be required to participate in these conditioning and strength sessions during the week rather than the weekend. While it is designed to promote student-athlete welfare, it may in fact

have a negative impact. For these reasons, I urge you to defeat this proposal. Thank you.

Josh Espinosa (Buena Vista University): On behalf of the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee, I speak in support of Proposal No. 54-1. We believe that allowing the football coaching staff to supervise the off-season conditioning of their student-athletes will ensure proper training and also protect the health and safety of these student-athletes. In addition, the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee has always supported equity among sports.

Currently, football is the only fall sport that does not have any type of nontraditional season. We agree that the four-day-per-week and no-weekend limitation minimizes the time constraints on academics. The proposed legislation ensures that football remains in compliance with the Division III philosophy and receives equitable treatment among fall sports. For these reasons, the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee is in full support of Proposal No. 54-1. Thank you.

Steve Keenum (McMurry University): I want to thank the New Jersey Athletic Conference for stating their rationale so clearly. I agree with the young man from the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee about football players needing the same opportunities for conditioning that every athlete does. But mostly, I stand as a father who has a son in high school who I want to have intense, structured, supervised conditioning to safeguard his well being because he competes in an activity that can cause injury. Each young man needs to spend time conditioning himself to make sure that he is as safe as he could be.

On Saturday, as I was listening to the NCAA catastrophic insurance discussion, it was brought to our attention, and this was some of the material that was distributed there, right now if the Division III athlete goes to the weight room to condition himself and he sustains an injury that results or is termed catastrophic in the long term, he does not meet the qualifications necessary to be covered by the policy. It says it includes preseason activities, practice sessions that are authorized and organized and directly supervised by the insured person's participating school.

This proposal allows an athlete who can be injured in this situation to be covered by this catastrophic insurance. I strongly urge the membership to pass this legislation because it's in the best interest of our student-athletes.

Bill Klika (Fairleigh Dickinson University, Madison): This piece of legislation and the reaction to it points out one of the great contradictions. Those who are voting against this are espousing the same arguments you would espouse for nontraditional seasons. So either football is like everything else or football isn't like everything else. If you want equity, football's in. If you want equity and you go the other way, then there's no nontraditional seasons.

Leon Lunder (Carleton College): Although the emotional plea of

equity is a good one to use in these kinds of discussions, what this proposal is asking for is five weeks of supervised weight training for football, not equitable practice opportunities like other sports have. It's five weeks of supervised weight training. There's injury potential outside of those five weeks. Based on the catastrophic insurance presentation by the gentleman prior, they're still susceptible outside that five-week period of time.

We have to be careful when we talk about equitable treatment. Maybe one of the concerns is this is the next step. The next step to this procedure would be to make it really equitable and start practicing and while we're at it let's add a few games.

Tim Millerick (Austin College): With all due respect to what's just been said, I've heard this argument for football for some time. I'd just like to defer a little bit and encourage people to think about a few things. The biggest thing on my mind is someone who considers this as safety. I think if you look in our weight rooms across the country, people are really working hard and lifting a lot of weight. I think we need equitable supervision and clear, consistent monitoring.

As a VP for student affairs and athletics at Austin College and someone who has worked in retention for over 15 years, we are all struggling to find and retain male students. I would encourage this group to look hard at how the spring can be enhanced with our coaches, who can legitimately interact with their players and be a positive force in their persistence at our institutions. I urge your support of 54-1. Thank you.

Don Harnum (Susquehanna University): I strongly urge defeat of 54-1. As an athletic director at a long-time football-playing institution, I see no competitive advantage to any institution by adopting this proposal. Many of us are dramatically strapped for facilities and staffing and athletic training as it is now. I can see now five weeks of 100 male athletes dominating our strength and fitness facilities and really taking opportunities away from all of our other recreation opportunities and other student-athletes in our programs. I think for that reason alone, it's not a good idea. I also am one who is strongly opposed to nontraditional seasons and this type of activity, which I call professionalism of Division III. So I urge us to defeat 54-1.

Dick Kaiser (Defiance College): I would like for someone in this body to enlighten me a bit. I am in favor of 54-1, but I wonder what five weeks of conditioning and weight training add to your liability and other insurance that you are now carrying for your student-athletes? I wonder if there would be a cost implication. If someone would know that answer it would help me decide on a vote.

Dewayne Barnes (National Student-Athlete Advisory Committee): As a former football student-athlete, I was talking to my colleagues. We've discussed this with football student-athletes. Football players are already in the weight room. We're already putting in time that we need to put in. If we have the coaches there, they're going to ensure that we have a safer environment to work in.

This is not a mandated thing. It's an optional thing. If schools don't want to do it, they don't have to do it. Just as they don't have to do it in other nontraditional sports that have those seasons. It is an optional thing. Thank you.

Steve Keenum (McMurry University): A couple of things about professionalizing Division III athletics. It's very obvious to me, as we work with young people, that this is a volunteer situation. There's no question about that. People talk about recruiting student-athletes. It's a volunteer deal. We have a volunteer football team here. There's no question about it. We're not going to change that by sending kids in a weight room and supervising them.

Last week at the American Football Coaches Association convention in San Antonio, I was asked by the Division III football coaches council chair to stand in support of this. The coaches believe very strongly in this. As this young man just said, the student-athletes are going to be better served if they are supervised. I don't think you're lessening your liability. In fact, I think you're improving your liability chances if you're supervising your athletes in the weight room instead of sending them in there by themselves.

Every institution I know of, as the athletic director on our campus, we want to maximize the use of our facilities. We have a great cooperative relationship among our staffs and we work together. That's going to be the object of this — working together to make this work. It is best for the student. I've heard it more times than not today. The welfare has to be up front for the student-athlete. That's what this is all about. Please support 54-1.

Carlyle Carter (Minnesota Intercollegiate Athletic Association): Under our current rules in Bylaw 17, strength and conditioning personnel may monitor voluntary individual workouts for safety purposes. If this passes, you can be guaranteed there won't be voluntary workouts. Whether or not it's stated as voluntary or not, if the strength coach or the coaches call for strength and conditioning, the student-athletes are going to be there.

I'm fortunate enough to have a son who plays Division I football, and he's currently in the only two-week period that he has off during the course of the year. The winter workouts are going to begin. He'll be getting up at 5 o'clock in the morning to make sure he gets to the weight room by 5:30 so that he can be done in time to get to an 8 o'clock class. It will not be a voluntary program.

I think that we really have a concern about our multisport athletes. If they're going to have a strength and conditioning program in the football nontraditional, without a nontraditional season, those student-athletes who participate in a second or a third sport, think about the level of work that they're going to have to put in.

Ms. Reighn: Thank you. We're now ready to vote on 54-1. Please cast your vote.

[Proposal No. 54-1 was defeated, 105-181-44.]

We will now return to Proposal 54. Are there any other comments

or discussion regarding Proposal 54?

Donna Ledwin (New Jersey Athletic Conference): Last year, the New Jersey Athletic Conference introduced legislation that placed parameters on practice and competition during the nontraditional season in the sports of soccer, field hockey, volleyball, baseball and softball.

This proposal, which was crafted with consideration of the concerns of both the student-athletes and the president, was passed by a convincing margin. This year, we return to the floor to propose legislation that would allow a similar, yet more limited, opportunity to our football student-athletes. Proposal 54 does not allow football competition during the nontraditional season. It does not even allow the use of sports equipment. It simply allows those students to participate in supervised conditioning and strength training sessions for a five-week period in the spring.

We believe that this proposal addresses two main issues: (1) student-athlete welfare—allowing properly supervised conditioning sessions; and (2) fairness—allowing opportunities similar to those given our other student-athletes. These two principles live at the heart of the Division III philosophy. We ask for your support of Proposal 54.

Suzanne Coffey (Bates College): On behalf of the Division III Management Council and Presidents Council, I urge you to defeat Proposal 54.

The impact of this proposal is far too great. It impacts multisport student-athletes by limiting their ability to participate in all sports. It impacts the availability of institutional facilities by permitting an out-of-season sport the ability to use those institutional facilities. It also impacts institutional staff members and their ability to provide adequate coaching assistance in multiple sports as many coaches are involved in more than one sport. For these reasons, I urge you to defeat this proposal. Thank you.

Don Harnum (Susquehanna University): I also urge defeat of 54. I couldn't have said it better than the previous speaker.

[Proposal No. 54 was defeated, 133-155-46.]

Playing and Practice Seasons—Nontraditional Segment—Lacrosse

Donna Ledwin (New Jersey Athletic Conference): On behalf of the New Jersey Athletic Conference, I would like to move Proposal 55.

[The motion was seconded.]

When the New Jersey Athletic Conference proposed legislation regarding the nontraditional season last year, lacrosse was included in the intent statement but inadvertently left out of the specific legislative proposals. This amendment corrects that oversight.

It should be noted that this proposal has been modified to reflect dates of competition rather than number of contests, in keeping with the editorial revisions made by the Division III Administrative

Committee. The rationale and motivation is no different than what was proposed last year for soccer, field hockey, volleyball, baseball and softball. We ask for your support of Proposal 55.

Susan Bassett (William Smith College): On behalf of the Division III Management Council and Presidents Council, I urge you to support Proposal No. 55.

This proposal represents a continuation of the principles adopted at the 2001 Convention related to the nontraditional segment in the sport of lacrosse. The proposal simply limits the maximum number of dates of competition that an institution may compete in during the nontraditional segment. The 2001 Convention Proposal No. 50 limited the length of the nontraditional segment. The contest limitation adopted in several other sports was simply omitted last year. This proposal rectifies that error, and I encourage you to support this proposal. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 55 was adopted, 276-9-38.]

Ms. Reighn: This concludes this afternoon's Presidents Council grouping. I want to thank you for your attention and your cooperation. We'll now take a quick 15-minute break and reconvene at 4 o'clock. Immediately following that break, we will open the window to reconsider any of the proposals voted on earlier this afternoon. Again, please remember the results are posted back there. Thank you.

[Note: The delegates recessed for 15 minutes.]

WINDOW OF RECONSIDERATION

Ms. Reighn: The window of reconsideration is now open for Proposal Nos. 40 through 55. As a reminder, a motion to reconsider can only be made by someone who voted on the prevailing side during the last vote. Any voting delegate can second that motion. Reconsideration then occurs by majority vote.

Finally, any reconsideration motion will require a roll-call vote since Proposal Nos. 40 through 55 were all roll-call votes. Is there a motion to reconsider any proposals that we handled before the break, Nos. 40 through 55, from someone who voted on the prevailing side?

Playing and Practice Seasons—Football— Nontraditional Segment

Peter Luguri (Plattsburgh State University of New York): Having voted on the prevailing side, I'd like to move for reconsideration on Proposal 54.

[The motion was seconded.]

Jerry Boyes (State University College at Buffalo): The biggest issue I believe that goes along with this, as a former football coach, it comes down to the nontraditional segment discussion. Football players currently, I would say, are discriminated against because they have no nontraditional segment in which to work on any type of their skills. I have football players who come to me wondering why the soccer, baseball or the softball player has that extra five weeks to work

on their skills. A football coach currently cannot even talk to a football player during the off season. It is not a facility issue. The kids are using that facility currently. I do believe it is a safety issue to have coaches in there to ensure that particularly freshmen, who come in many times not knowing proper techniques, are supervised so we don't take away the safety issue.

I don't believe that having five weeks is going to discourage a football player from playing in another sport. When you do have non-traditional practices from other sports, that does discourage those multisport athletes. I would ask you to reconsider your vote and vote for Proposition 54.

Linda Case (State University College at Brockport): We also sponsor football. Many of us in the room have been coaches of various sports. I'd ask you as a coach, if you were the women's soccer coach, would you think it fair that the women's soccer team couldn't have five weeks of strength and conditioning when another team on campus could? This is a safety issue and it's an equity issue. Those of us who have football know the reality that our kids are in the weight rooms, some of them with strength and conditioning coaches, some of them without. Passing this proposal isn't going to put a strain on your facility; it's going to allow your student-athletes to be in a safer environment. Thank you.

Dewayne Barnes (Student-Athlete Advisory Committee): I'm a former football student-athlete. To pass this legislation, it's up to the individual institutions to give football student-athletes the opportunity—the same opportunity as other sports have. As strength and conditioning stands, the strength is done inside the weight room where conditioning can be done outside on the fields. In addition, there are other student-athlete teams in the weight room at that time. In the spring time, the football players are already in there. So there's going to be no strain on the facilities. Contact with the football coach outside the already short season for football is key, not only to build the skill, but also to build a positive relationship between coaches and student-athletes year-round. Thank you.

Chuck Winters (Gettysburg College): For the past eight years, I've been the conference administrator assigned to work with the Centennial Conference football coaches. In those eight years, I've come to believe that Division III football players and coaches are guilty by association. That association is that they play football, which is also played in Division I and Division II.

Before we adjourned, there was a speaker who spoke to the ills of what's happening in Division I as it relates to the demands on the student-athlete. I concur with what he said. But to me, those are issues, those are problems, those are violations that need to be addressed in Division I. Unfortunately, I think what this body does and has done over the last eight years is make the assumption that our coaches in Division III, that our football student-athletes in Division III, will make the same mistakes.

I propose to you that we give them the opportunity to prove us wrong. If we find that our football coaches and our student-athletes abuse this five-week opportunity to weight train, we can come back here next year and tell them: "Hey, you were just like some of the problems we've observed in the other two divisions. We didn't like what you did. We're going to take it away." But I stand before you to ask you to give them the opportunity to prove us all wrong. Thank you.

Mark Walsh (Aurora University): I'm the commissioner of the Illini-Badger Football Conference. I think as a body, we have reaffirmed the importance of the nontraditional segment as recently as last year. Part of that rationale were the benefits of the contact of the coaches who were valuable teachers and mentors. I hope that we have one of our most valuable teachers and mentors in charge of the squad that has the largest numbers at our institutions that have football. In my mind, I think we're missing the point about the benefit of having one of our best teachers and mentors and his staff working with our student-athletes.

The institutions that have facility problems, I would say don't do it. The institutions that have problems with multisport athletes, I would say don't do it. In my mind, you can take care of the multisport athlete problem by asking them to prioritize the season that they're in. But once again, one of the benefits of the proposal is the contact time, which may lead to better retention, and the mentoring ability of our coaches. I hope you would have confidence in them and I urge you to support this proposal.

Don Harnum (Susquehanna University): I would again urge us to defeat this proposal. With due respect to my colleagues who have argued for it, I'll tell you, I love football. We would have tremendous difficulties in our facilities. Coaches are not going to say you 12 show up when you like to show up and we'll work with you. There's going to be 40, 50, 60 players at a time. They are going to be showing up at 5 o'clock or 5:30 in the morning because our facilities don't allow for this type of volume. I can think on my own campus of half a dozen baseball players and half a dozen track athletes who are not going to be competing in those sports because the football coaches, and with all good intent, are going to put pressure on them to do their lifting before they go in and they can't do both. I think this is a detrimental move to our football athletes. Everybody doesn't need to lift weight in the spring. If no one lifts weight we're all going to have fair competition. I don't think this is a wise move for Division III.

Mike Clary (Rhodes College): I urge you to reconsider Proposal 54. The opportunity for student-athletes participating in football to have a supervised strength program is a matter of equity. It is also an issue of safety and liability. Until we deal with the issue of other sports having a nontraditional season, this issue of football not having an opportunity to be with our coaches is not going to go away.

I'm a former chair of the Division III Football Committee. We've

got to give our Division III football coaches more credit than what some of us are doing. I wasn't surprised there was an overwhelming majority of those coaches realize that a lengthy contact period, injury-riddled spring practice type situation would not work in Division III.

Most of those football coaches have come through as assistant track coaches or head baseball coaches. I think we've got to give them the benefit of the doubt that they are committed to two-sport athletes. I think you will find very few football coaches who are discouraging football players from playing baseball or running track. I'm not sure that's the situation with some of our other sports that have non-traditional seasons.

I urge you to give football athletes who participate in Division III football the same opportunity. This issue is not going to go away. In fact, it's probably going to come back with stronger legislation if we don't deal with this at some point. Thank you.

Dennis Collins (North Coast Athletic Conference): This morning, I rose to take NC-4 out of the consent package, which would eliminate the restricted voting privilege. On this issue, 334 Division III members voted on it. There's only 225 members in the room that have football. So more than 100 votes were cast, on a very close vote decided by less than 20 votes, by more than 100 schools that do not have football.

Ms. Reighn: I think there were 48 abstentions as well.

Mr. Collins: Forty-six.

Ms. Reighn: Thank you.

Carlyle Carter (Minnesota Intercollegiate Athletic Conference): In our conference, in our nontraditional seasons, we do not allow competition but we do have the opportunity for seven volunteer practice opportunities. In one of our situations, in the sport of softball, the coach took that to mean seven all-day practices on Saturday. I would ask the sponsors of this legislation to identify the number of hours that are inherent in this legislation. Five weeks? How many hours?

Ms. Ledwin: I would simply say it's a matter of good, common sense. You need to supervise your coaching staff and look out for the best interest of your student-athletes. (Applause.)

Tom Weingartner (University of Chicago): I rise to speak against this proposal. I believe that the current NCAA rules allow for a strength and conditioning coach who is eligible to work with all of our varsity athletes in strength and conditioning. That mitigates, it seems to me, the safety issue.

Tim Millerick (Austin College): About 18 months ago, I entered into this question at our institution that the opinion for nontraditional sports for everyone should not exist. That's how I started. But I've come away with an analysis of our institution. We are not privileged or in a position to create a strength coach. We have been asking ourselves how to do it. I've talked to the NCAA a couple times about how to use a strength coach across the board to comply with this new

legislation. It's very difficult for us right now.

So for those of you who abstained or tried to figure out what this all means with regard to football, my analysis is that the risk can be dealt with in a better way, facility use can be dealt with in a better way, dual sport athletics can be dealt with. I know it's a challenge for them; I understand that. But I'm not sure at our institution we have a lot of those people. We do have some, but we don't have a lot.

Lastly, our student-athletes have spoken very strongly to nontraditional on our campus. I would urge you to reconsider this. Thank you.

Ms. Reighn: Thank you. We are now ready to vote on the motion to reconsider Proposal 54. It is an electronic vote.

[The motion to reconsider Proposal No. 54 was adopted, 158-118-47.]

The motion to reconsider Proposal 54 has been adopted. We're now ready to reconsider No. 54.

Donna Ledwin (New Jersey Athletic Conference): I would call the question.

(Applause.)

Ms. Reighn: We need a separate motion to cease debate, unless there is no further discussion. Okay. So we can vote. We're ready to vote on Proposal No. 54. This is a re-vote.

[Proposal No. 54 was adopted on reconsideration, 149-116-54.]

Are there any other motions to reconsider? Okay, that concludes our roll call votes for today. We can vote on the rest of our proposals, but please keep your electronic voting machine handy in case we need to use them on any close paddle votes.

We are now ready to vote on Proposal No. 56.

Senior Woman Administrator—Appointment

Suzanne Coffey (Bates College): On behalf of the Division III Presidents Council, Management Council and Interpretations and Legislation Committee, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 56.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal will permit an institution with a female athletics director to appoint a separate female who reports to the director of athletics as the senior woman administrator. Currently, a school with a female athletics director cannot formally designate another female administrator as the senior woman administrator, even though many programs have adopted this model in practice.

This proposal is permissive legislation granting an institution the authority to appoint such an individual as the SWA. The Committee on Women's Athletics supports this proposal. Also, the Division II Presidents Council has agreed to sponsor a similar proposal for the 2003 Convention.

As a final note, the senior woman administrator position was originally established as a way to involve an athletics administrator who is female in the decision-making process for the institution's

overall intercollegiate athletics program. This proposal is consistent with that intent and furthers the involvement of women in the administration of athletics on campus.

For these reasons, I urge your support.

[Proposal No. 56 was adopted.]

Definition of Student-Athlete

Arleigh Dodson (Northwest Conference): On behalf of the Northwest Conference, I move No. 57.

[The motion was seconded.]

The vote on NC-6 this morning was because of the process, not the content. NC-6 concerns only a start of student-athlete status while No. 57 concerns the start and the stop of student-athlete status. A better choice would be to match start versus start and stop versus stop in order to achieve this choice, which I believe, from a series of things, is the best choice, particularly the best choice for student-athletes. I move to divide the first and the second sentences.

[The motion to divide was defeated.]

Arleigh Dodson (Northwest Conference): Excuse me, just let me shuffle here. All right. I want to then, I'm going to have to break out both ends, and so I want first to examine NC-6-(a). That is you become a student-athlete by enrolling as a recruit. That is you're recruited and you enroll. The Presidents Council in making their argument for the Amateurism Task Force, argued that there is a preenrollment issue; argued for clarity, common sense, and consistency; and argued that it needed to shift the focus from intent to competitive experience.

NC-6-(a) consists exclusively of intent on the part of the athletic staff. That is, in recruiting, it is the recruiter's choice that you become a recruit. The person being recruited has absolutely no choice. So if the coach comes up and says, "I want you as a recruit at my institution," then you are a recruit no matter how many times you say no because of the definition of recruiting.

Since the coach said, "I want you as a recruit," you have no way of knowing whether they really want you. Intent is unknowable. Therefore, the NCAA has developed two means of measuring intent. In Divisions I and II, it's the letter of intent; where all parties sign, it is then clear what the intent is. In Division III it's actions. Actions. So it makes no difference what your intent is.

The recruiting rule 13.02.5.1 gives three actions. The first action is a paid visit. Partial or full pay, you are a recruit. The second is an arranged off-campus encounter with one of three sets, either the prospect, the relatives or the guardians. Therefore, it is entirely possible that the prospect has never been contacted, that the relatives or guardians have. In fact, when you're looking at our conference and all private liberal arts colleges with tuitions in excess of \$20,000, often you're looking to talk with relatives and guardians and not much with the prospect.

The third, initiating and arranging more than two electronic contacts with the prospect's relatives and guardian. With the advent of the computer, two things happen. Our campuses use a computer software program that automatically kicks out all of the people who check an interest in athletics and then automatically there's a contact through the coaches.

In addition, in one sport in particular—I notice it's a pattern in the sports that are developing—the recruiters wait until the class is recruited and comes to the campus or at least receives the letters that they are admitted to the class. And in the size of our schools that's about 500. And those 500 are contacted electronically and then they come to campus in person, prior to enrollment. So that 100 percent of some campuses are student-athletes. None of these people know they're student-athletes.

So the answer could be this has been the rule for many years. So what? So what? We've lived all these years, we don't do anything about it, and we don't much care? So what? The principle of student-athlete welfare says that you shall involve student-athletes in matters pertaining to their lives, and Constitution 6.1.4 says you shall, each institution, establish SAACs for student-athletes. None of you, none, allow these students, recruited just as I told you under Item A, in your SAAC, that is they have never participated, never participated.

Secondly, the rules of compliance, the principal rules of compliance, 2.8, you shall monitor all rules to ensure compliance. None of you are monitoring rules to assure compliance on category A, student-athletes, never participated. Emphasis. These have never participated. And many, if not most, never will.

In all cases, 10, 12, 15, 16 articles, the penalty is that you lose participation. But remember none of them have participated. So the penalty is a very strange penalty. But one of them, just to show how dogged it is and how bad it is, is the outside competition rule in basketball. It is unique to basketball.

I know you're tired, I know you've wrestled with some of these things, but I am going to read you the consequences. If the student—and this is strictly the student who is recruited by a member institution in part for basketball ability and subsequently enrolls in the institution—never plays, this prohibition against outside basketball competition remains applicable until the student-athlete's intercollegiate basketball eligibility has been exhausted, including—this includes coverage while a student is officially withdrawn from the college—fulfillment in a residency requirement subsequent to transfer to another college, awaiting transfer, or enrolled in a nonmember collegiate institution.

Ms. Reighn: Thank you. I appreciate that.

Mr. Dodson: I'm not done. (Laughter.)

Ms. Reighn: There is a 10-minute maximum. You're getting close.

Mr. Dodson: All right. The second part is the participation part.

And on the participation part there are differences between the two proposals. My proposal has in it every word tied to a definition to the Constitution and bylaws whereas the other does not.

And the final point relative to that issue is that while they look the same, there is a dramatic difference. And the final test, and this is—I'll end right here because I'm not going to walk you through the ending of it—the final test, and here, if there is—what you do, this is written to say exactly what you do.

And if what you do right now, all of you, in eligibility, differs by application of this, with even one student, then you ought to vote against it. But if it's exactly what you do, and that's why it's written that way, it is exactly what you do, you should vote for it. So you're then in a position you vote, if you vote against it, you keep where you are, which I think is a travesty, particularly having gone to that honors banquet. I think this smears the name of a student-athlete to have nonparticipants, never participates as student-athletes.

Ms. Reign: Thank you.

Stacie Wentz (Salisbury University): Now that you are all confused about this proposal, I promise to be brief. On behalf of the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee, I speak in strong opposition to Proposal No. 57. The legislation to redefine the term student-athlete causes many points of confusion. The rules that go along with being a student-athlete should not be transitory. This new legislation potentially causes reinstatement and compliance issues at each member institution. In essence, it creates an on/off switch in defining a student-athlete. We, the student-athletes, believe that the current definition of student-athlete is clear and sufficient. Therefore, we oppose Proposal No. 57. Thank you.

Tim Gleason (Ohio Athletic Conference): On behalf of the Division III Presidents Council, Management Council and Interpretations and Legislation Committee, I urge you to defeat Proposal 57. This proposal will make the process of tracking student-athletes more confusing for the membership. Further, the proposal will increase the administrative effort required to track individuals who may seek their status turned on or off.

In terms of the bigger picture, the rationale behind the proposal itself is unclear. Over the past few years, the membership has not identified the current student-athlete definition as troublesome. The Interpretations and Legislation Committee examined this legislation during its deregulation efforts but did not recommend any substantive changes as the committee cannot receive any notice from the membership that legislation was difficult to understand or track. That begs the question: Why change legislation to make it more difficult for the membership to understand if the current definition is clearly understood?

It should be noted that Bylaw 12.02.5, part A of Proposal 57, has indeed been modified by noncontroversial Proposal No. NC-6, which can be found in your blue pages. NC-6 will standardize the definition

of student-athlete in a clear, consistent manner, thus eliminating the need to adopt Proposal 57.

[Proposal No. 57 was defeated.]

Athletics Personnel—Employment With Professional Sports Organizations

Travis Feezell (Whitman College): On behalf of the Division III Presidents Council, Management Council and Interpretations and Legislation Committee, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 58.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal deletes the prohibition on institutional coaches being employed by professional sports organizations. The committee and councils agreed that policies regarding employment of coaches should be left up to the institution and its own policies. The NCAA should not dictate such policies. This proposal represents the continued efforts to deregulate the Division III Manual. Last year, the membership adopted 14 such employment deregulation proposals. Further, it should be noted that Divisions I and II have adopted proposals similar to this one.

For these reasons, I urge you to support this proposal.

Carlyle Carter (Minnesota Intercollegiate Athletic Conference): As part of the deregulation package, I believe over the years the Division III members have supported every piece of legislation that has come to us in the form of deregulation. To allow our staffs to take immediate benefit of this proposal, I would ask that the Management Council in their post-Convention meeting consider an immediate effective date, if possible.

[Proposal No. 58 was adopted.]

We are now ready to consider Proposal No. 59. But I have a clarification to report. During its post-Convention meeting, the Management Council intends to issue an official interpretation that the effective date for this proposal is not retroactive. This proposal only affects courses taken on or after August 1, 2002.

Eligibility—Nontraditional Courses

Sandra Slabik (Neumann College): On behalf of the Division III Interpretations and Legislation Committee, Management Council and Presidents Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 59.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal permits Division III student-athletes to use hours earned in nontraditional courses combined with hours earned in residence to fulfill the full-time enrollment requirement. It also permits hours earned in nontraditional classes to be used to meet satisfactory-progress requirements.

This proposal is about institutional autonomy. It gives each Division III institution the academic freedom to accept hours taken via a nontraditional format. This legislation does not propose that we must now have policies to accept these classes, but only if your poli-

cy at your institution allows this for other students, it now provides an opportunity for student-athletes as well. The current legislation precludes these hours for student-athletes without any consideration to an institution's willingness to accept such hours for all other students. Division III continuing-eligibility rules are based on institutional guidelines. This proposal further supports that principle.

For these reasons, I urge you to support this proposal. Thank you.

Kevin LaGree (Simpson College): On behalf of the Division III Presidents Council, I also urge your support of the adoption of Proposal No. 59. This proposal gives each institution autonomy to decide whether to accept hours earned in nontraditional methods to count towards full-time enrollment and satisfactory-progress requirements. Student-athletes will be able to use these hours, provided the institution accepts them for all other students. Therefore, academic integrity will not be sacrificed because of this check in the system.

The bottom line is that Proposal 59 permits each institution to make the call for all its students. Such a result is consistent with the recent deregulation efforts and the Division III philosophy related to academic integrity.

For these reasons, I also urge you to support this proposal. Thank you.

Ed Streb (Rowan University): I rise to speak against this proposal for four reasons. First, the proposal places no limits on the number of nontraditional courses a student may take. Second, it precludes midcourse intervention on the part of faculty and staff. Third, it provides an opportunity for widespread abuse. And fourth, alternatives are currently available.

Let me explain each of these four points very quickly. Number one, it places no limits on the number of courses that can be taken. The legislation, as currently worded, essentially requires that you only take hours on campus in addition to the hours in extension courses. Meaning you could take nine or 10 hours through distance learning courses in another institution. It's our feeling that philosophically if a student is going to represent an institution on the playing field, they should be students at that institution, not students at the University of Phoenix.

Secondly, the failure to limit the number of courses leads to inherent problems. We see inherent problems with the failure to limit. One problem is that faculty athletic representatives, coaches and academic advisors are generally involved in student intervention. One of the things that goes on on so many campuses is that coaches and faculty reps check with faculty members to find out midcourse how the students are doing. Are they completing their work in a timely fashion? Are they successful in class? Are they understanding the material? When they are failing to complete work or failing to understand the material, interventions are taken. Such intervention may include counseling, tutoring, etc.

It will be difficult, if not impossible, for anyone to intervene during the middle of the semester when students are taking distance-learning courses. Now, if they were only taking one course of every four courses through the distance learning system, that might not be a major problem. But if they're taking as many as nine or 10 hours over the semester under these circumstances, we see a major problem here.

The third item is it provides opportunity for widespread abuse. Having taken a course by distance learning and also having taken a course on how to teach by distance learning, I can assure you there is no way to ensure that the student who is taking the distance learning course is actually the student who is doing the work in that course. While we would all like to think that students would be above board on this, and we would again acknowledge that if only one course were taken under these circumstances, we might be able to accept this, but as many as three or four courses, we have problems.

Finally, we recognize there are times when students may need to take courses through extension services. Alternatives are available. Students can take such Internet courses right now out of season. They can take above and beyond the 12-hour limit. Or they can take them under circumstances where the NCAA will allow them to apply for a waiver.

So given these four objections, first, that there are no limits on the number of courses that can be taken; second, that this proposal would preclude midsemester intervention; third, that it provides opportunity for widespread abuse; and finally, that alternatives are available, the faculty athletics representative association urges your defeat of Proposal 59.

Dick Kaiser (Defiance College): Speaking on behalf of myself and President Jim Harris, we speak against this proposal. It's interesting for many of us who were here when the NCAA used to all meet together, you would remember that the NCAA closed a window for potential abuse of correspondence courses and the number that you could take in the summertime so people weren't going through garage doors to get various classes to remain eligible.

We, in Division III, it appears to me, have just opened up another door where a football team or a baseball team or a volleyball team could be attending your institution for three hours and attending a junior college for nine via the Internet.

Art Eason (William Paterson University of New Jersey): Could a person take 33 hours of credit at my institution, play football there, and take the other nine at any other institution via the Internet?

Chris Martin (NCAA Staff): We do have legislation already that talks about that. Bylaw 14.1.7.2.3 talks about concurrent enrollment at two institutions. In your situation, if your institution considers that student-athlete to be full-time at your institution and accepts the hours from the other institution, you could use that. Again, it's your institution's discretion as long as you consider them to be enrolled as a full-time student.

[Proposal No. 59 was defeated.]

**Playing and Practice Seasons—
Foreign Tours**

Garnett Purnell (Wittenberg University): On behalf of the Interpretations and Legislation Committee, Management Council and Presidents Council, I move for the adoption of Proposal No. 61.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal standardizes the opportunities for foreign tours for all Division III sports. Currently, the sports listed in the intent statement of Proposal 61 are permitted to conduct a foreign tour once every four years. All other Division III sports may participate in such a tour once every three years. This proposal permits all Division III sports an opportunity to participate in a foreign tour once every three years. All of the sports currently subject to the once-in-four-years limitation are sports that conclude with a national collegiate or national governing body championship. This proposal moves those sports in line with the sports that conclude with Division III championships.

On the basis of fairness and equality for student-athletes, I urge your support for this proposal. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 61 was adopted.]

**Playing and Practice Seasons—First Permissible
Contest and Practice Date—Football**

Gary Karner (Wisconsin Intercollegiate Athletic Conference): On behalf of the WIAC, I would like to withdraw Proposal No. 62. The reason for this withdrawal is that in drafting this legislation, it was not recognized that occasionally the calendar is such that the 11th week prior to Division III football playoffs falls after the Labor Day weekend. As a result, to pass this legislation as worded, in several years, it would increase the length of the playing season from 11 to 12 weeks.

This was never our intent. Our purpose in drafting this legislation was simply to give institutions that have difficulty in filling their conference schedules greater flexibility by allowing them to play their first contest one day sooner, Thursday, as opposed to Friday, before Labor Day. The WIAC will likely draft further legislation without increasing the overall length of the playing season. Thank you.

**Contest Exemptions—Men's Volleyball—
Molten Championship**

Zak Ivkovic (City University of New York Athletic Conference): On behalf of the City University of New York Athletic Conference, I ask that you adopt Proposal No. 63.

[The motion was seconded.]

As the rationale states, the NCAA currently has a men's volleyball championship, but up until this moment, no Division III school has ever participated in it. In its place we have the Molten

Championship, which is paid and financed through sponsors and through member institutions that compete. We'd like to permit the schools that participate to exempt the two days that they compete from its maximum number of contests. This action would allow this tournament to be treated as other season-ending tournaments. I urge you to adopt this proposal. Thank you.

Mike Ricciardi (North Eastern Collegiate Volleyball Association): I would also like a positive response. This tournament was developed about five or six years ago for the lack of a season-ending tournament. With this tournament now strictly Division III, it would give us the opportunity to declare a Division III championship until the NCAA picks it up. Thank you.

Page Remillard (Agnes Scott College): In the rationale, it says to exempt the tournament from playing dates. Currently, independent institutions are not exempt from end-of-season playing championships, whereas conference members are exempt. Does this exemption include independents?

Ms. Reign: It would include any team that participated in the tournament.

Gary Karner (Wisconsin Intercollegiate Athletic Conference): We support this proposal. There may be others, but I'm aware of at least one sport currently where we do exempt the national championship and that's the national collegiate gymnastics championship that involves about 16 Division III institutions in very similar circumstances. I would encourage support of this particular proposal.

[Proposal No. 63 was adopted.]

Ms. Reign: I want to thank you for your attention and cooperation for the last eight proposals. We'll now open the window of reconsideration for proposals 56 through 63. Just a reminder that a motion to reconsider must be made by someone on the prevailing side. Any voting delegate can second that motion for reconsideration and then it occurs by majority vote. Is there a motion to reconsider any of the proposals that we handled after the break? The window of reconsideration is now closed.

Before I turn it back to Tom, I'd just like to make a few comments and thank you for the wonderful opportunity that's been afforded to me the last four years to serve on the Management Council. I've had many wonderful experiences over the last four years. I've produced and released my first video, as most of you saw on the bus over to the national office the other night. It's been a tremendous experience. But it was a busy year. I have a great amount of respect for my fellow colleagues on the Management Council, many of whom I have worked with on various committees. I've learned so much. I've been challenged. I truly did enjoy this experience.

I also want to thank my administration for affording me the opportunity, giving me the encouragement and support that I needed to participate in this capacity the last four years. I encourage the present administrators here to also urge your athletic directors to par-

ticipate on these committees and be involved actively in the membership.

I think we have a great division, a lot of diversity and different degrees of philosophy. But we all have the same thing in common. We talk about it all the time, and that's student-athlete welfare. I think we're at a real crossroads in the next few years, and I'm very confident that we will do the right thing. The beginning of this new subcommittee by the Management Council and the Presidents Council is a great start and I encourage you to be proactive.

I think there's some people behind the scenes who rarely get recognized. These people have been a tremendous help to me during the last four years, particularly the last year as chair. I'd just like to recognize Sharon Tufano, who runs around behind the scenes all the time. (Applause) I also think we're very fortunate to have Dan Dutcher and Bridget Belgiovine as our staff liaisons. They do a tremendous job with all the committees and there's a tremendous amount of work behind the scenes. We're here today as a direct result of them prepping Tom and I. They spend a great deal of time with many of you throughout the year. So please, join me in thanking Dan and Bridget.

(Applause)

Chris Walker (University of Redlands): Before we leave today, we would be remiss if we did not recognize Joy Reign's contributions this year. As chair of the Division III Management Council, she has served with distinction. She's a complete professional, yet never takes herself too seriously.

If you've had the pleasure of working with Joy, you know she is very organized, tough-minded, and she's a caring individual, particularly about student-athletes. She's very open to dialogue with others, very nonassuming and has a great sense of humor. Joy is the kind of person who, when 9:30 or 10 p.m. rolls around and she might like to relax or get some work done, never hesitates to spend time with a new committee member to make them feel welcome.

Joy is a consummate team player, yet she can lead with authority, which we have observed this year. Her leadership of our division has been outstanding. She has worked hard in moving our division forward. We have much to thank her for. Please join me in recognizing our Management Council chair, Joy Reign, for her leadership and hard work. (Applause)

Mr. Courtice: By the way, you did a great job this afternoon, Joy. Thank you.

Ed Streb (Rowan University): Thank you. I rise to appoint a personal privilege. As the faculty athletics rep at Rowan University, I'd like to tell everyone here what a privilege it's been to work with Joy Reign these last few years. I'd like to be first to congratulate her on behalf of Rowan University for the fine job she's done. The president and the vice-president for student affairs and myself got together and decided to present Joy with a dozen red roses today, but then we fig-

ured it might be difficult for Joy to get these things on the plane. The thorns could be considered a weapon, I guess. So, Joy, we'll simply present you with one rose today and assure you that when you return to Rowan, the other 11 will be in your office. Congratulations. (Applause)

Mr. Courtice: There is one item of business that remains—the election of our new Management Council members. There are three new appointments and one reappointment to be made. To present the official slate of nominees, I'll call on Valerie Cushman, director of athletics at Randolph-Macon Woman's College. Valerie.

Valerie Cushman (Randolph-Macon Woman's College): On behalf of the Nominating Committee, I move formal election of three new representatives and one reappointment to the Division III Management Council. This slate of candidates was approved by the Management Council and Presidents Council at their October 2001 meeting and by the Administrative Committee and is now presented to the Division III membership for election.

The slate of candidates is: Douglas Hastad, president, University of Wisconsin-La Crosse, in the Wisconsin Intercollegiate Athletic Conference; Joyce Wong, director of athletics, Eastern Connecticut State University in the Little East Conference; Chad Yowell, director of athletics, Wheaton College in the New England Women's and Men's Athletics Conference; and for reappointment, Connee Zotos, director of athletics, Drew University in the Middle Atlantic Athletic Corporation.

Mr. Courtice: Thank you, Valerie, as you return to the Nominating Committee and thanks to you and the rest of the committee.

Are there any other nominees from the floor? Hearing none, I'd ask all of those in favor to identify so by raising your paddles. Opposed, the same sign. Abstentions. Don't you dare. It's a vote. Congratulations to the new Management Council members. (Applause)

Dan points out that we should also announce the appointment of Dewayne Barnes from Whittier to the national Student-Athlete Advisory Committee. (Applause) Esther Barazzone, Chatham College; David Carter, Eastern Connecticut State University; and Phil Stone, Bridgewater College, will be new members of the Presidents Council.

Are there any other topics of interest that come before this group?

Leon Lunder (Carleton College): Before we leave, I just want to remind people that we do have the reception for the National Association for Division III Athletic Administrators in Marriott Ballroom 1 beginning at 5:30.

Bette Landman (Arcadia University): On behalf of the Presidents Council and governing bodies of the NCAA, I would like to take this time to extend our deepest appreciation for the work that Tom Courtice has provided to the Presidents Council this year. Those

of you who have heard him this morning can probably infer the things I'm going to say. We have thoroughly enjoyed our time with Tom as we've worked with him through a number of issues.

Tom is one of the those rare individuals who can combine elegance, perception and precision in the way he speaks. He is a man telling us, "oh, I didn't know I had to speak on this." You would never know it when you hear him because he is always right on and his words are carefully chosen.

Secondly, Tom brings balance to the consideration of the issues before us. He is not at all unaware of the fact that we live by values and mission and passion about what we do. But at the same time, we know very well that anything that we pass here in terms of regulations must be acted on at the ground level by real people and real institutions doing real things. Tom has often been one who has brought us back from one of those other extremes to make sure that we always take a look at both sides of an issue. Tom can bring passion, but at the same time, he also has a good antennae to know what is the thinking of the policy.

Lastly, I would tell you that Tom is also a man, and we've all thoroughly appreciated this trait in him. He cares about the efficiency of what we do and making sure that any time we give as volunteers is well spent. We've gone to a consent agenda to action items so that we can spend time really discussing some of the issues that are before us, not only today but down the road.

As you can imagine, this is a rare and unusual individual. I want to extend our heartfelt thanks for the leadership he has provided. (Applause)

Mr. Courtice: Thank you, Bette, and thank all of you for a good day and great open discussion. We stand adjourned.

(The Division III Business Session was adjourned at 5:10 p.m.)

Appendix A

96th Annual Convention LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS SUBMITTED BY THE MEMBERSHIP

[Note: In the following proposals, those letters and words that appear in *italics* are to be deleted and those letters and words that appear in **bold face** are to be added. All page numbers listed refer to the corresponding pages in the 2001-02 NCAA Divisions II and III Manuals.]

TOPICAL GROUPINGS OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS 95th ANNUAL CONVENTION

<i>Proposal Numbers</i>	<i>General Topic</i>
1 through 45	Division II Legislative Proposals
1 through 9	Consent Package
10 through 30	President Council Grouping
31	Amateurism
32 through 33	Recruiting
34 through 38	Eligibility
39	Financial Aid
40	Awards and Benefits
41 through 45	General
46 through 77	Division III Legislative Proposals
46 through 54	Presidents Council Grouping
55 through 63	General
64 through 77	Deregulation Package

DIVISION II LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS

The NCAA Division II Presidents Council has determined that it will deal primarily with those national issues in Division II athletics that prompt wide-spread concern among Division II chief executive officers.

Legislative proposals developed by the Division II Management Council or by Division II committees reporting to it must be submitted to the Division II Presidents Council for review. They cannot be placed on the agenda for consideration at the Convention unless the Presidents Council agrees to sponsor them. This procedure was established to affirm presidential control of intercollegiate athletics in Division II.

The Division II Presidents Council has identified those proposals that it believes are of particular interest to Division II chief executive officers and has included them in the Presidents Council grouping. It should be noted, however, that inclusion of proposals in the Presidents Council grouping does not necessarily constitute a position by the Division II Presidents Council for or against a proposal. Those proposals with an asterisk before the proposal number have been identified by the Presidents Council as roll-call votes. Delegates should refer to each proposal's source line for information regarding the sponsor of each proposal.

Legislative Proposals _____

A-1

[Note: Pursuant to Constitution 5.3.13, all amendments shall become effective not earlier than the first day of August following adoption at the NCAA Convention; however, if a voting delegate wishes to propose an immediate effective date, or to propose any other effective date prior to the first day of August, a two-thirds majority of all delegates present and eligible to vote on the amendment is required to approve the immediate or alternative effective date. Those proposals that were submitted with an immediate effective date are noted with an asterisk (*) by the effective date. Those proposals that receive the required vote to carry an immediate effective date and that are adopted, become effective upon adjournment of the Convention.]

CONSENT PACKAGE

NO. 1 (NO. 2-11) ELIGIBILITY JOINT COLLEGE/HIGH-SCHOOL PROGRAM

Intent: To modify requirements related to joint high-school/college programs that would begin a student-athlete's eligibility under the 10-semester/15-quarter rule, as specified.

Bylaws: Amend 14.2.3.3, page 110, as follows:

[Division II]

"14.2.3.3 Joint College/High-School Program. A student-athlete's eligibility under the *five-year/10-semester/15-quarter* rule does not begin while a student is enrolled in a collegiate institution in a joint high-school/college academic program for *outstanding* high-school students, in which the courses count as both high-school graduation credit and college credit, provided the student **has not officially graduated from high school is classified as a special student, is not considered by the college to be regularly matriculated and is not eligible** does not practice (including limited preseason tryouts) or compete for the college's athletics programs."

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Administrative Review Subcommittee)].

Effective Date: Immediately.*

Rationale: The Administrative Review Subcommittee has reviewed and granted waivers where student-athletes "trigger" their 10-semester/15-quarter period of eligibility due to a joint high-school/college academic program that does not designate itself as designed for "outstanding" students or even has a "special" classification program. In those cases, the student-athletes met the intent of the rule, but the program lacked the specific classification required by the current legislation.

Action: Adopted.

**NO. 2 (NO. 2-14) ELIGIBILITY - SEASONS OF
COMPETITION - FOREIGN TOUR**

Intent: To permit a student-athlete who qualified for a hardship waiver during the previous academic year to engage in competition on an institution's foreign tour during the summer vacation period at the conclusion of that academic year without using a season of competition.

Bylaws: Amend 14.2.5.2.6, page 113, as follows:

[Division II]

"14.2.5.2.6 Foreign-Tour Competition. A student-athlete who qualifies for a hardship for the previous academic year would not utilize a season of competition if the student-athlete represents the institution on a certified foreign tour during the summer-vacation period at the conclusion of that academic year."

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council (Management Council (Legislation Committee)).

Effective Date: Immediately.*

Rationale: An institutional foreign summer tour provides a cultural experience for student-athletes and generally is used in preparation for the following academic year. Under current legislation, a student-athlete who qualifies for a hardship waiver during the previous academic year is charged with a season of competition for that year if he or she participates on a summer foreign tour after the conclusion of the academic year. This proposal is consistent with other legislation that permits a student-athlete (e.g., redshirt, transfer student) who did not engage in outside competition during the previous academic year to participate on an institution's summer foreign tour without using a season of competition.

Action: Adopted.

**NO. 3 (NO. 2-15) SATISFACTORY-PROGRESS WAIVERS -
INDEPENDENT INSTITUTIONS**

Intent: To require that satisfactory-progress waivers submitted by independent institutions be administered by the NCAA Division II Academic Requirements Committee.

Bylaws: Amend 14.4.3.5, page 124, as follows:

[Division II]

"14.4.3.5 Waivers of Satisfactory-Progress Rule. The Academic Requirements Committee shall establish appropriate criteria for waivers of this legislation. Such waivers shall be administered by the conference members of the Association or, in the case of an independent institution, by the *Student-Athlete Reinstatement Committee Academic Requirements Committee*.

Waivers of the satisfactory-progress rule may be granted under any of the following conditions."

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Academic Requirements Committee)].

Effective Date: Immediately.*

Rationale: Currently, legislation requires that the NCAA Division II Student-Athlete Reinstatement Committee administer medical absence and international competition satisfactory-progress waivers submitted by independent institutions. Inasmuch as the Academic Requirements Committee currently reviews all other satisfactory-progress waivers, it would be more appropriate for that committee to review all satisfactory-progress waivers.

Action: Adopted.

NO. 4 (NO. 2-18) ELIGIBILITY - TRANSFER RESIDENCE REQUIREMENT

Intent: To permit a student-athlete to transfer and immediately be eligible when the student-athlete's institution loses accreditation.

A. Bylaws: Amend 14.5.5.3.10, page 130, as follows:
[Division II]

[14.5.5.3.10-(a) unchanged.]

"(b) The student has not transferred previously from one four-year institution, unless, in the previous transfer, the student-athlete received an exception per Bylaw 14.5.5.3.7 (discontinued/nonsponsored sport exception) or 14.8.1.2-(d) (residence requirement);"

[14.5.5.3.10-(c) through 14.5.5.3.10-(e) unchanged.]

B. Bylaws: Amend 14.8.1.2, page 134, as follows:
[Division II]

[14.8.1.2-(a) through 14.8.1.2-(c) unchanged.]

"(d) For a student-athlete who transfers to a member institution to continue the student-athlete's opportunity for full participation in a sport because the student-athlete's original institution lost regional accreditation and was reclassified to corresponding membership per Constitution 3.2.5.3."

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Legislation Committee)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2002.

Rationale: This proposal is related to discussions regarding immediate loss of active membership due to loss of accreditation. The Presidents Council and Management Council agreed that current legislation should remain in place so that if an institution

loses accreditation, it would be reclassified immediately to corresponding membership. The Councils agreed that, in such a case, student-athletes should have the ability to transfer and immediately be eligible even in cases when they are not eligible to use one of the current legislated transfer exceptions. Further, the student should not be precluded from using the one-time transfer exception at a later date. This also would limit the number of NCAA Division II Administrative Review Subcommittee cases that would likely be submitted when an institution loses accreditation and has student-athletes desiring to transfer as a result of the institution's changed status.

Action: Adopted.

**NO. 5 (NO. 2-19) ELIGIBILITY - OUTSIDE COMPETITION
- WORLD UNIVERSITY GAMES**

Intent: To include the World University Games as an exception to the outside-competition legislation.

Bylaws: Amend 14.7.5.1, pages 133-134, as follows:

[14.7.5.1-(a) through 14.7.5.1-(d) unchanged.]

"(e) Official World Championships, World University Games and World Cup Tryouts and Competition. A student-athlete may participate in official World Championships, World University Games and World Cup tryouts and competition."

[14.7.5.1-(f) unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Olympic Sports Liaison Committee)].

Effective Date: Immediately.*

Rationale: Current NCAA legislation prohibits a student-athlete from participating during the academic year in competition as a member on any outside, amateur team unless a specified exception exists to accommodate such participation. Other elite international events, such as the Olympic Games and World Cup, are legislated exceptions; however, an exception currently does not exist for the World University Games. This proposal will provide such an exception when the World University Games are conducted during the academic year.

Action: Adopted.

PRESIDENTS COUNCIL GROUPING

***NO. 6 (NO. 2-1) MEMBERSHIP - VOTING
CONFERENCE REQUIREMENTS**

Intent: To specify sports-sponsorship requirements necessary for multi-sport voting conference membership.

Legislative Proposals _____

A-5

A. Constitution: Amend 3.3.1.1, page 12, as follows:

[Division II]

"3.3.1.1 Conference Competition Requirement. Conference membership is available to duly elected athletics conferences of colleges and universities that conduct conference competition and determine a champion in one or more sports in which the Association conducts championships or for which it is responsible for providing playing rules for intercollegiate competition. **Voting rights and other membership privileges (e.g., Management Council representation) are available only to those multi-sport conferences that satisfy the requirements set forth in Constitution 3.3.2.2."**

B. Constitution: Amend 3.3.2.2, page 12, as follows:

[Division II]

"3.3.2.2 Voting Rights and Other Conference Membership Privileges. Only those multi-sport member conferences that meet the criteria listed below shall be permitted to vote on issues before the Association and access other membership privileges (e.g., Management Council representation, Enhancement Fund Distribution) afforded to such conferences."

C. Constitution: Amend 3.3.2.2.3, pages 12-13, as follows:

[Division II]

"3.3.2.2.3 Four Five-Sport/Three-Season Requirement. *The A voting member conference shall conduct conference competition in at least four five sports for men, with at least one in each season, for the conference to vote on issues related solely to men's programs and four five sports for women, with at least one in each season, for the conference to vote on issues related solely to women's programs. A season-ending tournament or round-robin regular-season play in a sport shall satisfy the conference competition requirement for that sport. For a sport to count as one of the five for men or one of the five for women, the following criteria must be satisfied:*

"(a)The conference must conduct a conference championship (e.g., round robin or tournament play) and name a conference champion in the sport;

"(b)In team sports only, the conference must conduct regular-season competition among the conference members sponsoring the sport; and

"(c)At least six conference member institutions must sponsor and compete in the sport."

"3.3.2.2.3.1 Waiver. The Management Council, by two-thirds majority of its members present and voting may waive the requirements of Constitution 3.3.2.2.3 if it deems that unusual circumstances warrant such action."

- D. **Constitution:** Amend 3.3.5 by adding new 3.3.5.1, pages 13-14, as follows:

[Division II]

"3.3.5.1 Failure to Comply with Five-Sport/Three-Season Requirement. A voting member conference that fails to satisfy minimum sports-sponsorship criterion in a given year shall be placed on probation for one year in the next academic year after noncompliance occurs. During this year, the conference shall not be eligible to receive the share of the Enhancement Fund that is based on conference sports sponsorship. A conference shall be afforded the one-year probationary period only once in every five-year period. The five-year period shall begin September 1 after the completion of the academic year in which the sports-sponsorship criterion is not met. If a conference fails to meet the minimum sport-sponsorship criteria at the end of the probationary year, or is ineligible for the once-in-five-year probationary period, it shall forfeit its voting conference membership and all associated privileges, immediately. A conference forfeiting voting conference membership in accordance with this legislation shall be ineligible to reapply for voting conference membership for at least one calendar year."

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Membership Review Project Team)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2002.

Rationale: This proposal is one in a package developed to assist Division II in planning for future membership growth in a way that provides for minimal disruption to services, programs, championship opportunities and other benefits available to current active and provisional members. The Membership Review Project Team agreed that the current requirements to be a voting conference are extremely easy to satisfy. Therefore, an "alliance" of institutions desiring to form a conference and gain access to automatic qualification, revenue distribution and representation on the Management Council and the Division II Student-Athlete Advisory Committee can do so with little organization and effort. Currently, a "conference" must only conduct some type of conference competition in at least four sports for men and four sports for women. There are no requirements on how the conference-competition requirement must be met. It can be met simply by having two teams play each other in a postseason contest. Since Division II is a conference-governed division, the project team agreed that all conferences should look somewhat similar in the context of the minimum requirements to be a conference and to have access to voting-conference benefits.

Action: Adopted, as amended by Proposal No. 6-1, 231-10-0.

**NO. 6-1 MEMBERSHIP - VOTING
CONFERENCE REQUIREMENTS**

Intent: To allow voting conferences to satisfy sports-sponsorship requirements by sponsoring five sports for men and five sports for women or four sports for men and six sports for women.

Constitution: Amend Proposal No. 6, 3.3.2.2.3, as follows:

[Division II]

"3.3.2.2.3 Five-Sport/Three-Season Sports-Sponsorship Requirement. A voting member conference shall conduct conference competition in at least five sports for men, *with at least one in each season*, and five sports for women, *with at least one in each season or four sports for men and six sports for women*. For a sport to count *as one of the five for men or one of the five for women* toward the minimum sports-sponsorship requirement, the following criteria must be satisfied:

- "(a) The conference must conduct a conference championship (round robin or tournament play) and name a conference champion in the sport;
- "(b) In team sports only, the conference must conduct regular-season competition among the conference members sponsoring the sport; and
- "(c) At least six conference member institutions must sponsor and compete in the sport.

"3.3.2.2.3.1 Three-Season Requirement. A voting member conference shall conduct competition in at least one sport for men in each season and at least one sport for women in each season."

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Membership Review Project Team)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2002.

Rationale: This amendment-to-amendment simply states that the proposed sports-sponsorship requirements for voting conferences may also be satisfied by sponsoring four sports for men and six sports for women. The original proposal restricted sponsorship to five sports for each gender. This amendment allows conferences flexibility in satisfying the proposed requirements. This amendment also retains, and states more clearly, the requirement that conferences must sponsor at least one sport for each gender in each of the three seasons (i.e., fall, winter, spring).

Action: Adopted.

**NO. 7 (NO. 2-2) MEMBER CONFERENCE -
ELIGIBILITY**

Intent: To establish a provisional membership category for prospective Division II voting conference members.

[Note: Appropriate editorial revisions will be made in NCAA Constitution 3.3 to reflect the adoption of this legislation.]

Constitution: Amend 3.3.1 by adding new 3.3.1.3, pages 12-14, as follows:

[3.3.1.1 and 3.3.1.2 unchanged]

[Division II]

"3.3.1.3 Provisional Membership Requirement. A newly formed conference desiring to attain voting conference status and gain access to voting conference membership privileges must complete a provisional membership period prior to becoming eligible for election. A conference that forms with six or more active members must complete a two-year provisional membership period. A conference that forms with fewer than six active members must complete a four-year provisional membership period."

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Membership Review Project Team)].

Effective Date: Immediately.*

Rationale: This proposal is one in a package developed to assist Division II in planning for future membership growth in a way that provides minimal disruption to services, programs, championship opportunities and other benefits available to current active and provisional members. In addition to the proposal to establish requirements for minimum sport sponsorship for voting conferences, the project team agreed that legislation should be sponsored to require new conferences to meet all membership requirements for a period of at least two years, prior to accessing voting conference membership privileges. This is consistent with other membership proposals for the 2002 NCAA Convention that will require conferences (and institutions) to demonstrate a commitment to the NCAA Division II philosophy and the governance structure of the division prior to accessing the benefits afforded to Division II active member institutions and voting conferences.

Action: Adopted.

NO. 8 (NO. 2-3) MEMBERSHIP - PROVISIONAL MEMBER EXPLORATORY PERIOD

Intent: To require institutions that desire to join Division II to complete an "exploratory period" prior to submitting a provisional membership application.

A. Constitution: Amend 3.6.1.1 by adding new 3.6.1.1.1.1, page 16, as follows:

[Division II]

"3.6.1.1.1.1 Exploratory Period. An institution may apply for provisional membership after completing a one-year exploratory period. The chief executive officer of the in-

stitution shall submit written notice of the institution's desire to begin the exploratory period. The notice shall be received in the national office (by mail) not later than June 15 one year before the June 15 deadline when the institution desires to apply for provisional membership. A nonrefundable exploratory fee in the amount of \$1,000 shall accompany the written notice."

B. Constitution: Amend 3.6.3.2, page 17, as follows:

[Division II]

"3.6.3.2 Application. An institution desiring to become a provisional member of Division II must complete a one-year exploratory period prior to submitting an application for provisional membership. The institution must notify the national office, in accordance with 3.6.1.1.1, in order to begin the exploratory period. Following the completion of the exploratory period, the institution may *this Association shall apply on or before June 15 on a form available from the national office for provisional membership if all application requirements set forth in 3.6 are satisfied. The application shall be received in the national office (by mail) not later than June 15 after completion of the exploratory period. A nonrefundable application fee in the amount of \$2,500 shall accompany the application form. In addition, a check in the appropriate amount for annual dues (see the current annual dues for active members per Constitution 3.7.3) also shall accompany the application. Should the applicant fail to qualify academically or fail election, the dues paid shall be refunded.*"

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Membership Review Project Team)].

Effective Date: Immediately.*

Rationale: This proposal is one in a package developed to assist Division II in planning for future membership growth in a way that provides for minimal disruption to services, programs, championship opportunities and other benefits available to current active and provisional members. The project team agreed that one of the most effective means of ensuring success in completing the provisional membership process, is to require institutions to spend one year evaluating the decision to join Division II. During this one-year period, the institution will receive NCAA mailings and have access to national office staff to receive accurate and timely information to assist in determining whether joining Division II is the best option for the institution. It will also assist the Membership Committee in planning each year for the incoming provisional class as it will be known one year in advance the number of institutions that may be eligible to apply.

Action: Adopted.

Intent: To require provisional member institutions to satisfy specified membership requirements in years one and two of the four-year provisional membership period.

A. Constitution: Amend 3.6.1.2.1, page 16, as follows:

[Division II]

"3.6.1.2.1 Four-Year Progression. During the first and second years of provisional membership, an institution shall apply the legislation of the Association to the greatest extent possible, except minimum sports-sponsorship requirements. An institution must satisfy sports-sponsorship requirements set forth in Bylaw 20.10.3 in years one and two. During the third and fourth years of provisional membership, an institution shall administer its athletics program in accordance with the constitution, bylaws and other legislation of the Association."

B. Constitution: Amend 3.6.1.2.1, page 16, as follows:

[Division II]

"3.6.1.2.1 Four-Year Progression. During the first and second years of provisional membership, an institution shall apply the legislation of the Association to the greatest extent possible, except minimum financial aid requirements. An institution must satisfy minimum financial aid requirements set forth in Bylaw 20.10.1.2 in years one and two. During the third and fourth years of provisional membership, an institution shall administer its athletics program in accordance with the constitution, bylaws and other legislation of the Association."

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Membership Committee)].

Effective Date: Immediately.*

Rationale: This proposal is one in a package developed to assist Division II in planning for future membership growth in a way that provides for minimal disruption of services, programs, championship opportunities and other benefits available to current active and provisional members. Another proposal in this package, if adopted, will require a prospective member to provide documentation indicating that minimum sports-sponsorship and minimum financial aid requirements are met at the time of application. This proposal simply strengthens that concept and clarifies that the institution must maintain such compliance in years one and two while applying all other legislation (e.g., recruiting, eligibility, etc.) to the greatest extent possible.

Action: Adopted.

***NO. 10 (NO. 2-5) MEMBERSHIP - ANNUAL LIMIT ON PROVISIONAL MEMBERS**

Intent: To provide the Management Council with the authority to establish an annual limit on the number of institutions that will be permitted to begin the four-year provisional membership period.

Constitution: Amend 3.6.1 by adding new 3.6.1.5, page 16, as follows:
[3.6.1.2 through 3.6.1.4 unchanged]

[Division II, roll call]

"3.6.1.5 Annual Limit on Provisional Member Institutions. The Management Council, based on the recommendation of the Membership Committee, may establish an annual limit on the number of eligible institutions that will be selected to begin the four-year provisional membership on September 1 following selection. Only those institutions that satisfy all applicable requirements set forth in Constitution 3.6 will be considered for selection."

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Membership Review Project Team)].

Effective Date: Immediately.*

Rationale: This proposal is one in a package developed to assist Division II in planning for future membership growth in a way that provides for minimal disruption to services, programs, championship opportunities and other benefits available to current active and provisional members. In order to provide a quality educational program for all institutions and manage the inevitable growth of Division II, the project team believes that the number of institutions in a provisional class should be limited. This will allow for those institutions in a class to receive more personalized assistance as set forth in the revised Provisional Member Educational Assessment Program. It will also enable the Membership Committee to better evaluate the status of provisional members and provide meaningful feedback once the annual review is completed.

Action: Adopted, 240-3-0

NO. 11 (NO. 2-6) PROVISIONAL MEMBERSHIP - ELIGIBILITY

Intent: To establish requirements that provisional member applicants must satisfy for an application to be considered.

A. Constitution: Amend 3.6.1.4, page 16, as follows:
[Division II]

"3.6.1.4 Four-Sport/Three-Season Requirement. After two years of provisional membership, the institution shall sponsor and conduct a representative schedule in a minimum of four varsity intercollegiate sports that involve all-male teams or mixed teams of males and females and four varsity intercollegiate

sports that involve all-female teams, subject to the requirements of the institution's conference(s), if any. For a provisional membership application to be considered, at least one sport involving an all-male team or a mixed team of males and females and at least one sport involving an all-female team shall be conducted in each sport season (i.e., fall, winter and spring). An institution may use a sport to meet the three-season requirement only if the institution has met the minimum contest and participants requirements for sports sponsorship in that sport as set forth in Bylaw 20.10.3.5. (See Constitution 3.6.4.5 regarding the provisional member's obligations in meeting this requirement.)"

- B. **Constitution:** Amend 3.6.1 by adding new 3.6.1.5, page 16, as follows:

[3.6.1.1 through 3.6.1.9 unchanged]

[Division II]

"3.6.1.5 Minimum Sports-Sponsorship Requirement. For a provisional membership application to be considered, the institution shall provide information indicating intent to sponsor, during the first year of provisional membership, the minimum number of sports required for Division II membership as set forth in 20.10.3."

- C. **Constitution:** Amend 3.6.1 by adding new 3.6.1.6, page 16, as follows:

[3.6.1.1 through 3.6.1.5 unchanged]

[Division II]

"3.6.1.6 Minimum Financial Aid Requirement. For a provisional membership application to be considered, the institution shall provide information indicating intent to provide, during the first year of provisional membership, financial aid to student-athletes in an amount equal to or greater than the minimum requirement set forth in Bylaw 20.10.1.2."

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Membership Review Project Team)].

Effective Date: Immediately.*

Rationale: This proposal is one in a package developed to assist Division II in planning for future membership growth in a way that provides for minimal disruption to services, programs, championship opportunities and other benefits available to current active and provisional members. The moratorium on new members has provided Division II with an opportunity to review current provisional membership requirements and to recommend amendments that allow the division to make changes to manage future growth and limit the impact of expansion on championship brackets, membership services and divisional resources. The current Division II requirements are easy to meet to be accepted as a provisional member. If an accredited institu-

tion located in the United States (or territories) submits an application fee and application by the appropriate deadline, it is eligible to become a Division II provisional member and, in the past, such applications would normally be approved. The project team concluded that it is important that prospective provisional institutions demonstrate a commitment to the Division II philosophy before they are considered for acceptance into a Division II provisional member class. The project team agreed that one requirement that best demonstrates this commitment is immediate compliance with minimum sports-sponsorship requirements; and, if adopted, the minimum financial aid requirement; as well as the three-season requirement.

Action: Adopted.

NO. 12 (NO. 2-7) PROVISIONAL MEMBERSHIP - APPLICATION FEE

Intent: To indicate that the provisional membership application fee will be determined by the Management Council as specified.

Constitution: Amend 3.6.3.2, page 17, as follows:

[Division II]

"3.6.3.2 Application. An institution desiring to become a provisional member of this Association shall apply on or before June 15 on a form available from the national office. A nonrefundable application fee *in the amount of \$2,500* shall accompany the application form. **The amount of the fee will be determined annually by the Management Council based on a continual analysis of expenses associated with the provisional member educational assessment program.** In addition, a check in the appropriate amount for annual dues (see the current annual dues for active members per Constitution 3.7.3) also shall accompany the application. Should the applicant fail to qualify academically or fail election, the dues paid shall be refunded."

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Membership Review Project Team)].

Effective Date: Immediately.*

Rationale: This proposal is one in a package developed to assist Division II in planning for future membership growth in a way that provides for minimal disruption to services, programs, championship opportunities and other benefits available to current active and provisional members. As expenses to provide educational services to provisional members increase due to changes to the Division II Provisional Member Educational Assessment Program, it will become necessary to fund some of these expenses from application-fee revenue. Therefore, it will be necessary to evaluate periodically this fee and increase the fee when appropriate.

Action: Adopted.

**NO. 13 (NO. 2-32) MEMBERSHIP -
RECLASSIFICATION FROM
DIVISIONS I OR III**

Intent: To specify that an institution declaring an intent to reclassify to Division II from Divisions I or III must satisfy Division II sports-sponsorship requirements at the time of declaration.

Bylaws: Amend 20.5.2, by adding new 20.5.2.2, page 272, as follows:
[20.5.2.1 unchanged]

[Division II]

"20.5.2.2 Reclassification to Division II from Divisions I or III - Sports-Sponsorship Requirement. An institution that desires to file an intent to reclassify to Division II from Division I or III must demonstrate compliance with Division II sports-sponsorship requirements at the time the intent letter is submitted."

[20.5.2.2 through 20.5.2.4 renumbered as 20.5.2.3 through 20.5.2.5, unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Membership Review Project Team)].

Effective Date: Immediately.*

Rationale: This proposal is one in a package developed to assist Division II in planning for future membership growth in a way that provides for minimal disruption to services, programs, championship opportunities and other benefits available to current active and provisional members. The Membership Review Project Team feels that, like with provisional members, institutions desiring to reclassify to Division II should be prepared to demonstrate a commitment to the Division II philosophy statement before they are permitted to begin the reclassification process. Under current Division III legislation, they will not be able to meet the new minimum financial aid requirement; however, the institution should be in a position to meet minimum sports-sponsorship requirements.

Action: Adopted.

***NO. 14 (NO. 2-33) MEMBERSHIP REQUIREMENTS -
PHILOSOPHY STATEMENT**

Intent: To revise the Division II philosophy statement as specified.

Bylaws: Amend 20.10, pages 273-274, as follows:

[Division II, roll call]

[20.10-(a) through 20.10-(d) unchanged.]

"(e) Believes in offering opportunity for participation in intercollegiate athletics by *permitting* awarding athletically related financial aid for to its student-athletes; and"

[20.10-(f) unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Membership Review Project Team)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2002.

Rationale: Members of the Presidents Council after reviewing recommendations from the Membership Review Project Team believe that this proposed revision to the Division II philosophy statement better represents the Division II membership's expectation that institutions should be providing a minimum amount of athletically related financial aid. This proposed change to the philosophy statement better reflects such an expectation.

Action: Adopted, 235-7-1.

***NO. 15 (NO. 2-34) MEMBERSHIP REQUIREMENTS -
PHILOSOPHY STATEMENT**

Intent: To revise the Division II philosophy statement as specified.

Bylaws: Amend 20.10, pages 273-274, as follows:

[20.10 (a) through 20.10 (e) unchanged]

[Division II, roll call]

"(f) Believes that funds supporting athletics should be controlled by the institution and that the emphasis for an athletics department should be to operate within an institutionally approved budget; and"

[20.10-(f) relettered as 20.10-(g) unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Membership Review Project Team)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2002.

Rationale: This amendment (addition) sets forth that Division II institutions, unlike Division I, do not have an expectation of self-sufficiency for athletics department funding. Rather, it sets forth that Division II programs are treated like other programs within the institution and that funds supporting athletics are managed by the institution and that Division II athletics programs strive to operate within an institutionally approved budget.

Action: Adopted, 230-14-0.

***NO. 16 (NO. 2-35) MEMBERSHIP REQUIREMENTS -
MINIMUM FINANCIAL AID
REQUIREMENT**

Intent: To establish a minimum financial aid requirement, as specified.

Bylaws: Amend 20.10.1 by adding new 20.10.1.2, page 274, as follows:

[20.10.1 renumbered as 20.10.1.1, unchanged]

[Division II, roll call]

"20.10.1.2 Minimum Awards. A member of Division II shall annually provide financial assistance that equals one of the following:

- "(a)** A minimum of 50 percent of the maximum allowable equivalencies in four separate sports, at least two of which must be women's sports;
- "(b)** A minimum total expenditure of \$250,000 in athletically related financial aid with at least \$125,000 in women's sports; or
- "(c)** A minimum of 20 total full equivalency grants with at least 10 total full equivalency grants in women's sports.

"20.10.1.2.1 Counting Financial Aid Awards to Satisfy Minimum Requirement. In counting financial aid awarded to student-athletes to determine if the requirements set forth in Bylaw 20.10.1.2 have been satisfied, the institution must satisfy the following:

- "(a)** Only countable financial aid, as set forth on the NCAA financial aid squad list form, may be used to meet the appropriate minimum;
- "(b)** Countable financial aid awarded to a student-athlete who has exhausted eligibility or awarded to a medically exempt student-athlete may be used to meet the appropriate minimum;
- "(c)** To be included in reaching the appropriate minimum, the financial aid actually must be awarded; and
- "(d)** Countable aid awarded in emerging sports for women and non-NCAA sports may not be used to meet the appropriate minimum.

"20.10.1.2.2 Waiver of Minimum Financial Aid Awards. The Management Council by two-thirds majority of its members present and voting, may waive the minimum financial aid awards required for Division II membership based on objective evidence that demonstrates circumstances that warrant the waiver of the normal application of that legislation.

"20.10.1.2.3 Failure to Meet Minimum Financial Aid Requirement

"20.10.1.2.3.1 One-Year Probationary Period. An institution that fails to meet the minimum financial aid requirement shall be placed on probation for one year for its entire program (both men's and women's sports) in the next academic year after noncompliance is discovered. An institution shall be afforded the one-year probationary peri-

od for failure to comply with minimum financial aid criteria only once in every 10-year period. The 10-year period shall begin the September 1 after completion of the academic year in which the membership criterion is not met.

"20.10.1.2.3.2 Application of Restricted Membership Status. If an institution fails to meet the minimum financial aid requirement at the end of the probationary year or is ineligible for the once-in-10-year probationary period, it shall be placed in "restricted membership" and shall not be eligible for NCAA championship competition in all sports (both men's and women's) in the first academic year after the probationary year (or the first academic year after failure to meet the requirements if the institution is ineligible for the once-in-10-year probationary period). If the institution still cannot certify compliance with the division criteria at the end of that year, it shall be reclassified as a corresponding member."

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Membership Review Project Team)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2005 for those institutions that are Division II active or provisional members as of August 1, 2001; immediately for any institution applying for provisional membership after January 14, 2002.

Rationale: This proposal is one in a package developed to assist Division II in planning for future membership growth in a way that provides for minimal disruption to services, programs, championship opportunities and other benefits available to current active and provisional members. This proposal will require all Division II institutions, both current and prospective members, to provide athletically related and other countable aid financial aid at a minimum level as permitted in Division II financial aid legislation and as referenced in the Division II philosophy statement. A minimum financial aid requirement as a criterion for membership distinguishes Division II from the other divisions within the Association and ensures that all institutions in Division II provide countable aid while maintaining institutional autonomy in determining how such aid should be distributed among different sport programs.

Action: Adopted, 219-24-2.

***NO. 17 (NO. 2-36) MEMBERSHIP REQUIREMENTS -
MINIMUM SPORTS SPONSORSHIP**

Intent: To increase the minimum sports-sponsorship requirement from four men's and four women's sports to five sports for each gender, or four men's and six women's sports; to allow sports

classified in Division I to count toward the minimum requirement and to allow institutions sponsoring both indoor and outdoor track to receive "credit" for both sports and to establish separate minimum participants requirements for indoor track and outdoor track."

A. Bylaws: Amend 20.10.3, page 274, as follows:

[Division II, roll call]

"20.10.3 Sports Sponsorship. A member shall sponsor a minimum of:

"(a) *Four Five* varsity intercollegiate sports, including at least two team sports, based on the minimum requirements of Bylaw 20.10.3.5 and involving all-male teams or mixed teams of males and females; and *Four five* varsity intercollegiate sports, including at least two team sports, based on the minimum requirements of Bylaw 20.10.3.5 and involving all-female teams; or

"(b) *Four* varsity intercollegiate sports, including at least two team sports, based on the minimum requirements of Bylaw 20.10.3.5 and involving all-male teams or mixed teams of males and females and *six* varsity intercollegiate sports, including at least two team sports, based on the minimum requirements of 20.10.3.5 and involving all-female teams."

B. Bylaws: Amend 20.10.3.1, page 274, as follows:

[Division II, roll call]

"20.10.3.1 Sport(s) Sponsored in Division I. *One of the two team men's and one women's* sports required in Bylaw 20.10.3-(a) *and or one of the two team men's and one women's* sports required in Bylaw 20.10.3-(b) may be sponsored in Division I."

C. Bylaws: Amend 20.10.3.5.8, page 275, as follows:

[Division II, roll call]

"20.10.3.5.8 Indoor and Outdoor Track and Field. Institutions *shall count may receive credit for sponsoring both* indoor and outdoor track and field *as a single sport* provided each team participates in the minimum number of contests with at least the minimum number of participants as set forth in Bylaw 20.10.3.5. Institutions also may receive credit for sponsoring both indoor and outdoor track and field, provided its team participates in a total of eight indoor and outdoor meets during the year, including at least three indoor and three outdoor meets."

D. Bylaws: Amend 20.10.3.5, pages 274-275, as follows:

[Division II, roll call]

"20.10.3.5 Minimum Contests and Participants Require-

ments for Sports Sponsorship. In each sport, the institution's team shall engage in at least a minimum number of intercollegiate contests (against four-year, degree-granting collegiate institutions) each year. In the individual sports, the institution's team shall include a minimum number of participants in each contest that is counted toward meeting the minimum-contest requirement. The following minimums are applicable:

Individual Sports	Minimum Contests	Minimum Participants
Track and Field, Indoor and Outdoor	5 4	14
Track and Field, Outdoor	4	14

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Membership Review Project Team)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2005 for institutions that are Division II active or provisional members as of August 1, 2001; Immediately for any institution applying for provisional membership or declaring its intent to reclassify to Division II on or after January 14, 2002.

Rationale: This proposal is one in a package developed to assist Division II in planning for future membership growth in a way that provides for minimal disruption to services, programs, championship opportunities and other benefits available to current active and provisional members. This proposal will help ensure that all Division II institutions, both current and prospective members, fulfill minimum sports-sponsorship requirements consistent with the Division II philosophy of offering intercollegiate athletics participation to as many students as possible. The proposal is consistent with the charge given to the Membership Review Project Team to analyze current membership requirements, which have not been reviewed since restructuring, and where appropriate, make recommendations to amend requirements to more accurately reflect the Division II philosophy and further the commitment to better define Division II's identity within the Association's structure.

Action: Adopted, 226-17-1.

NO. 18 (NO. 2-37) MEMBERSHIP REQUIREMENTS - SCHEDULING REQUIREMENTS

Intent: To eliminate the requirement that a Division II institution must schedule and play more than 50 percent of its contests in football and men's and women's basketball in an academic year against Divisions I and II institutions.

Bylaws: Amend 20.10.4, pages 276-277, as follows:

[Division II]

"20.10.4 Football and Basketball Scheduling

"20.10.4.1 Football. A member shall schedule and play at least 50 percent of its football games in an academic year against institutions classified in Division II or Division I in that sport.

"20.10.4.2 Basketball. A member shall schedule and play at least 50 percent of its men's basketball games and 50 percent of its women's basketball games in an academic year against members of Division II or Division I.

"20.10.4.3 Counting Contests

"20.10.4.3.1 Membership Classification of Opponent. In determining whether an institution meets the scheduling criteria of Division II, each opponent shall be counted as it was classified on September 1 of the academic year involved.

"20.10.4.3.1.1 Second Year of Reclassification. An institution that is in its second year of its two-year reclassification period may be counted by its Division II active member opponents in meeting their Division II scheduling requirements.

"20.10.4.3.1.2 Waiver. The Management Council, by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting, may grant a waiver of the provisions of By-laws 20.9.4.1 or 20.9.4.2 in cases of reclassification of an opponent when there is an enforceable game contract, executed in writing, or in the case of similar contractual problems.

"20.10.4.3.1.3 Provisional Member Opponents. A provisional institution that has been a member of the Association for a minimum of one year may be counted by its provisional or active member opponents in meeting their scheduling requirements.

"20.10.4.3.2 Canceled Games. A canceled game shall not be counted toward meeting the Division II scheduling criteria unless the Management Council, by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting, approves a waiver of the criterion in a situation in which:

"(a) The member institution can document that it had scheduled (for that academic year) the appropriate minimum percentage of contests with members of Division II or Division I, under enforceable game contracts executed in writing;

"(b) An opponent canceled a game that it had contracted to play that academic year; and

"(c) Despite a good-faith effort, the institution was unable to rearrange its schedule to play the appropriate percentage of contests with members of Division II.

"20.10.4.3.3 Alaska, Hawaii or Puerto Rico. Games played in Alaska, Hawaii or Puerto Rico shall not be counted for purposes of meeting the division's scheduling requirement if such games are exempt from counting toward the playing-season limitations.

"20.10.4.4 Waivers

"20.10.4.4.1 Geographical. An institution may appeal to the Management Council for a waiver of the scheduling requirements per Bylaw 20.10.4 on the basis of geographical difficulty in achieving the minimum-scheduling requirements. The Management Council may grant such waivers by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting.

"20.10.4.4.2 Conference. An institution that is a member of a conference predominantly composed of institutions that are not members of the NCAA (or an NAIA district that requires all NAIA members to play each other) may appeal to the Management Council for a waiver of the scheduling requirements per Bylaw 20.10.4, provided it schedules and plays at least 50 percent of its nonconference games in the appropriate sport against members of Division II or Division I. The Council may grant such waivers by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting.

"20.10.4.4.3 Submission Deadline. Waiver requests per Bylaws 20.10.4.4.1 and 20.10.4.4.2 must be received in the national office not later than June 15 immediately after the academic year in which the scheduling requirement was not met."

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council (Management Council (Membership Review Project Team)].

Effective Date: Immediately.*

Rationale: This proposal is one in a package developed to assist Division II in planning for future membership growth in a way that provides for minimal disruption to services, programs, championship opportunities and other benefits available to current active and provisional members. Members of the Membership Review Project Team believe that, consistent with the Division II philosophy statement, all sports, not simply football and basketball should be scheduling primarily Division II opponents. Rather than propose minimum requirements for other sports it seems more appropriate to eliminate the current requirements for football and basketball and allow the various sports committees in Division II to establish minimum scheduling requirements (e.g., 22 games against other Division II institutions in basketball) for championship selection purposes. Minimum scheduling should be a championships-eligibility issue rather than a membership criterion.

Action: Adopted.

***NO. 19 (NO. 2-20) (Dereg. No. 1) PLAYING AND PRACTICE
SEASONS - INDIVIDUAL
SKILL INSTRUCTION**

Intent: To eliminate the requirement that individual skill instruction be requested by the student-athlete.

A. Bylaws: Amend 17.02.1.1, pages 178-179, as follows:

[Division II, roll call]

[17.02.1.1-(a) through 17.02.1.1-(d) unchanged.]

"(e) In sports other than football, participation outside the institution's declared playing season in **voluntary** individual skill-related instructional activities with a member of the coaching staff *and that occur at the request of the student-athlete (see Bylaw 17.1.6.2.1);*"

[17.02.1.1-(f) through 17.02.1.1-(m) unchanged.]

B. Bylaws: Amend 17.1.5.2.1, page 181, as follows:

[Division II, roll call]

"17.1.5.2.1 Skill Instruction. Participation by student-athletes in individual **voluntary** skill-related instruction (including the activities set forth in Bylaw 17.02.1.1-(f)) in sports other than football is permitted outside the institution's declared playing season, provided no more than four student-athletes from the same team are involved in skill-related instruction with their coach(es) at any one time in any facility *and the student-athletes request the instruction.*"

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Legislation Committee)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2002.

Rationale: Individual skill instruction requested by the student-athlete is not a realistic concept. It appears that institutions are complying with other requirements related to skill instruction but for an institution to have a documented process by which student-athletes actually request the instruction is rare. This recommendation does not affect the number of student-athletes involved in permissible skill instruction and does not eliminate the requirement that the instruction must be voluntary. This recommendation simply satisfies the deregulation goal of eliminating legislation that requires unnecessary documentation and tracking by compliance administrators that is not even occurring now on a regular basis. Skill instruction would remain voluntary, but time and other scheduling issues could be done by coaches without having to wait on student-athletes to "request" the instruction.

Action: Adopted, 233-8-0.

***NO. 20 (NO. 2-21) (Dereg. No. 2) PLAYING AND PRACTICE
SEASONS - COUNTABLE
ATHLETICALLY RELATED
ACTIVITIES**

Intent: To revise the definition of a countable athletically related activities as specified.

A. Bylaws: Amend 17.02.1.1, pages 177-178, as follows:

[Division II, roll call]

"17.02.1.1 Countable Athletically Related Activities. *The following are considered cCountable athletically related activities and must be counted in the weekly or daily time limitations specified under Bylaw 17.1.5.1: include*

"(a) Practice, *which is defined as any meeting, activity or instruction involving sports-related information and/or having an athletics purpose, held for one or more student-athletes at the direction of, or supervised by, any member or members of an institution's coaching staff. Practice is considered to have occurred, if one or more coaches and one or more student-athletes engage in any of the following activities:*

"(1) Field, floor or on-court activity;

"(2) Setting up offensive or defensive alignment;

"(3) Chalk talk;

"(4) Lecture on or discussion of strategy related to the sport;

"(5) Activities using equipment related to the sport;

"(6) Discussions or review of game films, motion pictures or videotapes related to the sport, except for the observation of an officiating clinic related to playing rules that is conducted by video conference and does not require student-athletes to miss any class time to observe the clinic; or

"(7) Activities conducted under the guise of physical education class work (e.g., any class composed of or including primarily members of an intercollegiate team on a required attendance basis or where the class uses equipment for the sport).

"(b) Competition;

"(c) Required weight-training and conditioning activities held at the direction of or supervised by an institutional staff member;

"(d) Participation in a physical-fitness class (including a summer class) conducted by a member of the athletics staff, unless such a class is a regular physical education class listed in the institution's catalog and open to all students. Such a class may not include practice activities conducted under the guise of physical education class work

"(e) In sports other than football, participation outside the institution's declared playing season in individual skill-related instructional activities with a member of the coaching staff and that occur at the request of the student-athlete (see Bylaw 17.1.6.2.1);

- "(f) In individual sports, participation outside the institution's declared playing season in individual skill-related instructional activities with a member of the coaching staff, except for individual-workout sessions during the summer that occur at the request of the student-athlete;*
- "(g) Required participation of student-athletes in permissible tryouts involving prospective student-athletes per Bylaw 13.12.2.1 or full-time students per Bylaw 17.02.12. If participation occurs outside the institution's declared playing season, it shall be counted as part of the conditioning activities specified in (c) above;*
- "(h) Required participation in camps, clinics or workshops;*
- "(i) Individual workouts required or supervised by a member of the coaching staff, except for those sports subject to the safety exception. A coach may design a voluntary general individual workout program for a student-athlete (as opposed to a specific workout program for specific days) but cannot conduct the individual's workout;*
- "(j) On-court or on-field activities called by any member or members of a team and confined primarily to members of that team that are considered as a requisite for participation in that sport (e.g., captain's practices);*
- "(k) Visiting the competition site in the sports of cross country, golf and skiing;*
- "(l) Use of an institution's athletics facilities when such activities are supervised by or held at the direction of any member of an institution's coaching staff. Facilities may be reserved for such use during the academic year. It is not permissible to reserve facilities during the summer to participate in permissible individual workouts in individual sports at the request of the student-athlete(s). In the event the use of an institution's facilities is requested by a team composed partly of enrolled student-athletes and partly of individuals not otherwise affiliated with the institution, use of the facilities shall be consistent with the policies established for outside groups generally; and*
- "(m) Involvement of an institution's strength and conditioning staff with enrolled student-athletes in required conditioning programs. Strength and conditioning personnel may monitor voluntary individual workouts for safety purposes. If the strength and conditioning coach also is a countable coach, such assistance may be provided only if that strength and conditioning staff member performs such duties on a department-wide basis."*

B. Bylaws: Amend 17.02.1.1 by adding new 17.02.1.1.1, pages 177-178, as follows:

[Division II, roll call]

"17.02.1.1.1 Exception – Strength and Conditioning Personnel. Strength and conditioning personnel may monitor voluntary individual workouts for safety purposes without considering such supervision as a countable ath-

letically related activity per 17.02.1.1. If the strength and conditioning coach is also a coaching staff member for one of the institution's intercollegiate teams, such assistance may be provided only if that staff member performs such duties for all intercollegiate teams."

C. Bylaws: Amend 17.1.5.2, page 181, as follows:

[Division II, roll call]

"17.1.5.2 Weekly Hour Limitations-Outside of Playing Season. Outside of the playing season during the academic year, only a student-athlete's participation in the countable athletically related activities specified in Bylaws 17.02.1.1-(c), 17.02.1.1-(d) and 17.02.1.1-(e) weight-training, conditioning and individual skill instruction shall be permitted. A student-athlete's participation in such activities shall be limited to a maximum of eight hours per week, of which not more than two hours per week may be spent on individual skill workouts set forth in Bylaws 17.02.1.1-(e) and 17.1.5.2.1. A student-athlete may not participate in any countable athletically related activities outside the playing season during any institutional vacation period (e.g., summer; academic year)."

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Legislation Committee)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2002.

Rationale: This is arguably one of the most difficult bylaws to understand and, therefore, it is difficult to correctly "count" the time spent on certain activities toward the maximum permissible hours each week, in part because it is difficult to determine at times where, or if, a certain activity "fits" on the list. It appears from the discussions held at the 2000 NCAA Division II Deregulation Summit that institutions regularly count activities differently. This concept would eliminate any misinterpretation of the current legislation and would simply empower the institution to determine if a certain activity is countable based on the application of the definition stated in the proposal. This concept clearly makes legislation in Bylaw 17 simpler to understand and apply, which is one of three goals of deregulation.

Action: Adopted, 235-6-0.

***NO. 21 (NO. 2-22) (Dereg. No. 3) PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS - WEEKLY TIME LIMITATIONS**

Intent: To limit participation by multiple-sport student-athletes to 20 hours per week of countable athletically related activities.

A. Bylaws: Amend 17.1.5.1.1, page 181, as follows:

[Division II, roll call]

"17.1.5.1.1 *Multisport Participant Exception.* For a multisport participant, the daily and weekly hour limitations apply separately to each sport in which the student-athlete is a participant."

B. Bylaws: 17.1.5.3 by adding new 17.1.5.3.8, pages 181-182, as follows:

[17.1.5.3 through 17.1.5.3.7 unchanged]

[Division II, roll call]

"17.1.5.3.8 Multisport Participants. Student-athletes participating in two or more sports are limited to a maximum of four hours per day and 20 hours per week. Playing season and outside of playing restrictions do not apply separately for multisport participants."

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Legislation Committee)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2002.

Rationale: A total of 20 hours per week regardless of the number of sports in which a student-athlete is involved is the maximum amount of time that a student-athlete should be involved in countable athletically related activities. During discussions between the Legislation Committee and the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee, it became evident that not only did student-athletes support this concept, but they also felt that coaches very seldom expected multiple-sport participants to be involved in more than 20 hours per week. The Legislation Committee agreed that removing the appropriate legislation from the Division II Manual was definitely deregulation of not only legislation that is possibly not being referred to often but also eliminates permissive legislation that is not in the best interest of student-athletes.

Action: Adopted, 287-3-1.

***NO. 22 (NO. 2-24) (Dereg. No. 4) PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS - COMPETITION DAY TIME LIMITATIONS**

Intent: To specify that for purposes of counting time limits for athletically related activities, scrimmages shall count as the actual duration of the activity.

Bylaws: Amend 17.1.5.3.2, page 181, as follows;

[Division II, roll call]

"17.1.5.3.2 Competition Day. All competition (except exempted scrimmages) and any associated athletically related activities on the day of competition shall count as three hours regardless of the actual duration of these activities. Scrimmages exempted per Bylaw 17.1.9.2-(d) against outside competition shall count as the actual duration of the activity."

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Legislation Committee)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2002.

Rationale: When an institution schedules a scrimmage that lasts

an entire day and then counts it as only three hours, it is not consistent with the original intent of this legislation. Currently, it is common for institutions to schedule such scrimmages and occupy an entire day of a student-athlete's time away from academics and other activities. If a scrimmage is designed to be a practice activity and be exempted from the total amount of contests that are permitted, then it should be treated more like a practice and not competition. This recommendation clearly meets the deregulation goal of ensuring that Division II legislation is consistent with the Division II philosophy.

Action: Adopted, 236-4-1.

***NO. 23 (NO. 2-25) (Dereg. No. 5) PLAYING AND PRACTICE
SEASONS - PRESEASON
OFF-CAMPUS INTRASQUAD
SCRIMMAGE**

Intent: To permit off-campus intrasquad scrimmages during the preseason practice period.

Bylaws: Amend 17.1.5.5.2, page 182, as follows:

[Division II, roll call]

"17.1.5.5.2 Preseason Off-Campus Intrasquad Games Prohibition. Preseason off-campus intrasquad games in all sports shall be prohibited."

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Legislation Committee)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2002.

Rationale: This legislation was discussed with coaches and administrators at the 2000 NCAA Division II Deregulation Summit. Based on the legislative history, it appears this prohibition was adopted in an Association-wide business session after being proposed by Division I to eliminate Division I "barnstorming" tours in basketball and football during the preseason practice period. The committee agreed that "barnstorming" tours should not be an issue in Division II, and there might be situations in which an off-campus practice/scrimmage (intrasquad practice) might be beneficial for public relations, fund-raising and attendance reasons.

Action: Adopted, 228-15-2.

***NO. 24 (NO. 2-26) (Dereg. No. 6) PLAYING AND PRACTICE
SEASONS - MISSED
CLASS TIME**

Intent: To prohibit student-athletes from missing class time for competition conducted in the nonchampionship segment in team sports.

Bylaws: Amend 17.1.5.5 by adding new 17.1.5.5.2, page 182, as follows:

[17.1.5.5 unchanged]

[Division II, roll call]

"17.1.5.5.2 No Class Time Missed for Competition in Non-championship Segment - Team Sports. In team sports (per 17.02.13.1) no class time shall be missed for competition conducted during the nonchampionship segment."

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Legislation Committee)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2002.

Rationale: The Legislation Committee believes that the philosophy of avoiding missed class time should be adopted for contests in team sports (e.g., baseball, volleyball, softball, etc.) conducted in the nonchampionship segment. If adopted, the proposed amendment addresses increasing concerns about extensive out-of-season practice and competition by limiting such participation to time when student-athletes are not in class. This concept would not be practical in individual sports (e.g., golf tennis, etc.) due to availability of facilities during times in which classes are not in session (e.g., golf courses or tennis clubs on weekends). Significant consideration should be given by the membership to the amount of class time student-athletes miss during the championship segment (e.g., baseball) and prohibit similar situations from occurring in the nonchampionship segment.

Action: Adopted, 162-83-2. Motion to reconsider defeated, 90-147-2.

***NO. 25 (NO. 2-27) (Dereg. No. 7) PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS - ANNUAL EXEMPTIONS**

Intent: To eliminate the lists of annual exemptions and once-in-four-year exemptions in each section of Bylaw 17 (i.e., each sport) and create two all-inclusive lists that will apply to all sports.

[Note: This proposal does not apply to emerging sports for women.]

A. Bylaws: Amend 17.1 by adding new 17.1.9, page 183, as follows:

[17.1.1 through 17.1.8 unchanged]

[Division II, roll call]

"17.1.9 Annual Exemptions. The following contests may be exempted annually from an institution's maximum number of contests.

"17.1.9.1 Automatic Exemptions. The following contests are automatically exempted from an institution's maximum number of contests in all sports each year:

- "(a) Conference Championships.** Competition in one conference championship tournament or playoff;
- "(b) Season-Ending Tournament.** Competition in one season-ending tournament (e.g., NCAA championship, NAIA championship). A season-ending tournament involves competition after the end of the regular season between teams that are not identified until the close of the regular season;
- "(c) NCAA Championship Play-In Competition.** Competition in play-in contests conducted prior to an NCAA Championship;
- "(d) Alumni Game.** One contest with an alumni team of the institution;
- "(e) Hawaii, Alaska, Puerto Rico (sports other than basketball).** Any contests played in Hawaii, Alaska or Puerto Rico, respectively, either against or under the sponsorship of an active member institution located in Hawaii, Alaska or Puerto Rico by a member institution located outside those locales;
- "(f) Fund-Raising Activity.** Any activities in which student-athletes from more than one of the institution's athletics teams participate with and against alumni and friends of the institution, the purpose of which is to raise funds to benefit the institution's athletics or other programs, provided the student-athletes do not miss class as a result of their participation;
- "(g) Celebrity Sports Activity.** Competition involving a maximum of two student-athletes from a member institution's team who participate in local celebrity activities conducted for the purpose of raising funds for charitable organizations, provided:
 - "(1) The student-athletes do not miss class as a result of the participation;**
 - "(2) The involvement of the student-athletes has the approval of the institution's athletics director; and**
 - "(3) The activity takes place within a 30-mile radius of the institution's main campus;**
- "(h) Tip-Off Classic - Basketball.** Games in the Division II Tip-Off Classic in men's and women's basketball;
- "(i) U.S. National Team.** One date of competition against the U.S. national team as selected by the appropriate national governing body in that sport;
- "(j) Spring Game - Football.** One contest at the con-

clusion of the spring practice period provided the contest is against a team comprised of bona fide alumni or students or both;

"(k) Postseason Bowl Game - Football. Participation in one postseason bowl game between representatives of two Division II conferences. The participating institutions shall be institutions not selected to participate in the Division II Football Championship;

"(l) East-West All-Star Match - Golf. Participation by a member or members of an institution's golf team in the East-West all-star golf match at the site of an NCAA golf championship on the day before the start of the competition (i.e., the practice-round day);

"(m) Sun Bowl All-American Classic - Golf. Participation in the Sun Bowl All-American Classic, provided not more than two student-athletes from the institution participate in that event;

"(n) College-Am Event - Golf. A "college-am" golf tournament, provided the event is held in conjunction with intercollegiate competition and student-athletes do not receive awards or prizes for such participation;

"(o) USA Gymnastics and NCGA Championships. Competition in the USA Gymnastics and National College Gymnastics Association (NCGA) collegiate gymnastics championships;

"(p) American Women's College Hockey Alliance Championship. Competition in the American Women's College Hockey Alliance national championship tournament;

"(q) United States Rowing Association Championships. Competition in the U.S. Rowing Association championships; and

"(r) National Governing Body Championship - Women's Water Polo. Competition in the national governing body championship for women's water polo.

"17.1.9.2 Discretionary Exemptions - Sports Other Than Football. In sports other than football, the following contests (or dates of competition) may be exempted from an institution's maximum number of contests each year. An institution may exempt no more than three contests from this list annually.

"(a) Foreign Team in U.S. A contest against a foreign team in the United States played in the facility in which the member institution regularly plays its home contests;

"(b) USA Club Team – Basketball. A contest against a "club" member of USA Basketball played in the facility in which the member institution regularly plays its home contests;

"(c) Non-Division II Four-Year Collegiate Institution – Basketball. An exhibition contest against a non-Division II four-year collegiate institution played between November 1 and the first permissible contest date; and

"(d) Practice Scrimmages. Informal practice scrimmage with outside competition conducted without official scoring.

"17.1.9.3 Foreign Tours. An institution may exempt from maximum contest limits all contests played on a foreign tour (certified in accordance with Bylaw 30.7) that occurs only once in a four-year period.

"17.1.9.4 Contests in Hawaii, Alaska or Puerto Rico – Basketball. In the sport of basketball, once every four years an institution may exempt four maximum contest limits one contest or tournament (not to exceed four contests) played in Hawaii, Alaska or Puerto Rico."

- B. **Bylaws:** Amend 17.4 through 17.28, pages 189-250, for each Division II sport by amending the respective sections entitled "Annual Exemptions" "Once-in-Four Years Exemptions – Certification Not Required – Foreign Tour" and "Once-in-Four Years Exemptions – Certification Required – Foreign Tour," as follows:

[Note: This proposal is presented in a nontraditional format. Appropriate revisions will be made in each of the sections specified above to reflect the adoption of this proposal. This bylaw reference is shown only to illustrate the recommended revision.]

[Division II, roll call]

"17.15.5.2 Annual Exemptions. The maximum number of dates of competition in the sport of rifle shall exclude the following:

"(a) Season-Ending Tournaments

"(1) NCAA Championship. Competition in the National Collegiate Men's and Women's Rifle Championships;

"(2) Conference Championship. Competition in one conference championship competition in rifle;

"(b) NCAA Championship Play-In Competition. Competition in play-in contests conducted before NCAA championships;

"(c) Alumni Match. One date of competition in rifle each year with an alumni team of the institution;

"(d) Foreign Team in U.S. One date of competition in rifle each year with a foreign opponent in the United States;

"(e) Hawaii or Alaska. Any dates of competition in rifle in Hawaii or Alaska, respectively, against an active member institution located in Hawaii or Alaska, by an active member located outside the area in question;

"(f) Fund-Raising Activity. Any rifle activities in which student-athletes from more than one of the institution's athletics teams participate with and against alumni and friends of the institution, the purpose of which is to raise funds for the benefit of the institution's athletics or other programs, provided the student-athletes do not miss classes as a result of their participation;

"(g) Celebrity Sports Activity. Competition involving a limit of two student-athletes from a member institution's rifle team who participate in local celebrity rifle activities conducted for the purpose of raising funds for charitable organizations, provided:

"(1) The student-athletes do not miss classes as a result of the participation;

"(2) The involvement of the student-athletes has the approval of the institution's athletics director; and

"(3) The activity takes place within a 30-mile radius of the institution's main campus.

"(h) U.S. National Team. One date of competition played against the U.S. national team as selected by the appropriate national governing body for rifle.

"17.15.5.3 Once-in-Four-Years Exemptions-Certification Required. An institution may exempt not more than one of the certified once-in-four-years exemptions from its maximum number of contests during any academic year and may not repeat participation in that event within a four-year period. The contest must be certified by the Division I Championships/ Competition Cabinet in accordance with Bylaw 30.10.3.

"17.15.5.4 Once-in-Four-Years Exemptions-Certification Not Required - Foreign Tour. The contests played on a foreign tour, provided the tour is conducted by the member institution in accordance with the procedures set forth in Bylaw 30.7 (also see Bylaw 17.30). An institution may not use this exemption in the same year that it uses an exemption set forth in Bylaw 17.15.5.3."

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Legislation Committee)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2002.

Rationale: The committee reviewed each section in Bylaw 17 and reviewed the list of annual exemptions for each sport and agreed that the lists are, for the most part, repetitive. By eliminating these lists for each sport and creating "master lists," the length of Bylaw 17 can be reduced significantly. By allowing all sports the

same number of annual exemptions (with some exceptions), the legislation will be much easier to apply and understand. Current legislation allows two exemptions in basketball that must be selected from a specific list (that includes scrimmages), while other exemptions are automatic. Current legislation allows three scrimmages in soccer, but they must count against the maximum number of contests, prohibiting the exemption of scrimmages that is allowed in other sports. This proposal would provide consistency to those requirements. This would also eliminate the requirement that the conference tournament count as one of the 27 permissible contests in basketball, which is not a requirement in any other sport. Other sports are permitted to exempt all contests played as a part of the conference season-ending tournament. Considering the problems that exist with the membership understanding contest exemption issues (e.g., the recent issue related to basketball exhibition games against Division I and III institutions), it makes sense to simplify legislation such as this which is what deregulation is designed to accomplish.

Action: Adopted, 239-1-1.

***NO. 26 (NO. 2-28) (Dereg. No. 8) PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS - PERMISSIBLE DATES AND OUT-OF-SEASON ACTIVITIES**

Intent: To redefine playing and practice season regulations for fall and spring sports except outdoor track and field and other selected sports.

[Note: This proposal does not apply to emerging sorts for women and other specified sports.]

A. Bylaws: Amend 17.7, pages 197-199, as follows:

[Division II, roll call]

"17.7 Cross Country. Regulations for computing the cross country playing season are set forth in Bylaw 17.1, General Playing-Season Regulations. (Also see Figures 17-1 and 17-2.)

"17.7.1 Length of Playing Season - Championship and Nonchampionship Segments. The length of an institution's playing season **for both segments** in cross country shall be limited to a 144-day season, which may consist of two segments (each consisting of consecutive days) and which may exclude only required off days per Bylaw 17.1.6.4 and official vacation, holiday and final-examination periods during which no practice or competition shall occur by the dates and regulations set forth in the remainder of this section.

[17.7.1.1 unchanged.]

"17.7.2 Preseason First Date of Practice - Championship

Segment. A member institution shall not commence practice sessions in cross country in the championship segment before the date that permits a maximum of 21 practice opportunities (see Bylaw 17.02.11) before the first scheduled intercollegiate contest August 10 or the first day of class, whichever occurs earlier.

"17.7.3 First Date of Competition - Championship Segment. A member institution shall not engage in its first date of competition (game or scrimmage) with outside competition in cross country in the championship segment before September 1 or the preceding Friday if September 1 falls on a Saturday, Sunday or Monday Thursday preceding Labor Day.

"17.7.3.1 Exception during the Years 1998-2001. It is permissible for an institution to engage in its first date of competition (game or scrimmage) with outside competition on August 25 during the years 1998-2000 and August 24 in the year 2001.

"17.7.4 End of Regular Playing Season - Championship Segment. A member institution shall conclude all practice and competition (meets and practice meets) in the sport of cross country by the last date of final examinations for the regular academic year at the institution in the championship segment by the conclusion of the NCAA Division II Cross Country Championship.

"17.7.5 First Date of Practice and Competition - Non-championship Segment. A member institution shall not commence practice sessions or engage in outside competition in the nonchampionship segment before February 15.

"17.7.6 End Date of Practice and Competition - Non-championship Segment. A member institution shall conclude all practice and competition in the non-championship segment no later than seven calendar days prior to the first date of the institution's final examinations.

[17.7.5 renumbered as 17.7.8, unchanged.]

"17.7.67 Out-of-Season (Nonchampionship Segment) Athletically Related Activities. Student-athletes and members of the coaching staff shall not engage in countable athletically related activities outside the institution's declared championship segment playing season per Bylaw 17.7.1 except as permitted in Bylaws 17.1.5.2 and 17.1.5.2.1. for the following:

"(a) Conditioning, Weight-Training and Skill Instruction. Student-athletes may participate in conditioning, weight-training and skill instruction in accordance with 17.1.5.2; and

"(b) Nonchampionship Segment Activities. During

the segment in which the NCAA Championship does not occur, student-athletes may participate in any practice or competition activity as permitted by other legislation provided such activity is restricted to a maximum of 24 days that occur within a period of 45 calendar days. The 45 calendar days must be within the dates set forth in 17.7.5 and 17.7.6."

[17.7.7 through 17.7.8 renumbered as 17.7.9 through 17.7.10, unchanged.]

[Note: This proposal is presented in a nontraditional format. Appropriate revisions will be made in all relevant sections of Bylaw 17 affecting fall sports (i.e., field hockey, soccer and volleyball).]

B. Bylaws: Amend 17.10, pages 204-208, as follows:

[Division II, roll call]

[17.10.1 unchanged.]

"17.10.2 Preseason Practice

"17.10.2.1 First Practice Date - Championship Segment. A member institution shall not commence official preseason football practice sessions in the championship segment, for the varsity, junior varsity or freshman team, before the date that will permit a maximum of 29 practice opportunities (see Bylaw 17.02.11) before its first scheduled intercollegiate game, except as provided for student-athletes who are first-time participants August 10 or the first day of class, whichever occurs earlier.

[17.10.2.2 through 17.10.2.3 unchanged.]

"17.10.3 First Contest - Championship Segment. A member institution shall not play its first contest (game or scrimmage) with outside competition in football in the championship segment before September 1 or the Thursday preceding Labor Day. An exception to the first contest date shall be permitted when selected to participate in the National Football Foundation benefit game or the American Football Coaches Retirement Trust benefit game, both sponsored by the National Association of Collegiate Directors of Athletics and played in the week before the beginning of the regular playing season in football. An exception to the first contest date shall exist during the years 1998-2001 to permit an institution to play its first contest (game or scrimmage) with outside competition in football on the weekend preceding the Labor Day weekend.

"17.10.4 End of Playing Season - Championship Segment. A member institution's last contest (game or scrimmage) with outside shall conclude all competition in football shall not be played after the second Saturday or Sunday

in December, except for the following: in the championship segment by the conclusion of the Division II Football Championship.

"(a) Spring Practice Scrimmage. One scrimmage or contest at the conclusion of spring practice, provided the game is with a team composed of bona fide alumni or students or both; and

"(b) Bowl Games, NCAA and NAIA Championships, International Competition, and Pioneer Bowl. One postseason game played in the Division II Football Championship; football contests played on a foreign tour certified by the member institution, or the National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics football championships. A member institution's last contest also may include participation in the Pioneer Bowl to be held between representatives of the Central Intercollegiate Athletic Association and the Southern Intercollegiate Athletic Conference no earlier than one week after the conclusion of the National Collegiate Division II Football Championship.

"17.10.5 First Date of Practice - Nonchampionship Segment. A member institution shall not commence practice sessions in the nonchampionship segment before February 15.

"17.10.6 End Date of Practice - Nonchampionship Segment. A member institution shall conclude all practice in the nonchampionship segment no later than seven calendar days prior to the first date of final examinations."

[17.10.5 through 17.10.8 renumbered as 17.10.7 through 17.10.10 unchanged.]

C. Bylaws: Amend 17.11, pages 208-210, as follows:

[Division II, roll call]

"17.11.1 Length of Playing Season - Championship and Non-championship Segments. The length of an institution's playing season for both segments in golf shall be limited to a 144-day season, which may consist of two segments (each consisting of consecutive days) and which may exclude only required off days per Bylaw 17.1.6.4 and official vacation, holiday and final-examination periods during which no practice or competition shall occur by the dates and regulations set forth in the remainder of this selection.

"17.11.2 Preseason First Date of Practice - Championship Segment. A member institution shall not commence practice sessions in golf in the championship segment before September 7 or the institution's first day of classes for the fall term, January 10 or the first day of class, whichever is earlier.

"17.11.3 First Date of Competition - Championship Seg-

ment. A member institution shall not engage in its first date of competition (*match or practice match*) with outside competition in golf in the championship segment before September 7 or the institution's first day of classes for the fall term, whichever is earlier February 15.

"17.11.4 End of Regular Playing Season - Championship Segment. A member institution shall conclude all practice and competition (*meets and practice meets*) in the sport of golf in the championship segment by the conclusion of the NCAA Division II golf championships.

"17.11.5 First Date of Practice and Competition - Non-championship Segment. A member institution shall not commence practice sessions or engage in outside competition in the nonchampionship segment before September 7 or the first day of class, whichever occurs first.

"17.11.6 End Date of Practice and Competition - Non-championship Segment. A member institution shall conclude all practice and competition in the nonchampionship segment no later than November 15.

[17.11.5 renumbered as 17.11.8 unchanged.]

"17.11.67 Out-of-Season (Nonchampionship Segment) Athletically Related Activities. Student-athletes and members of the coaching staff shall not engage in countable athletically related activities outside the institution's declared championship segment playing season *per Bylaw 17.11.1*, except as permitted in Bylaws 17.1.5.2 and 17.1.5.2.1. for the following:

"(a) Conditioning, Weight-Training and Skill Instruction. Student-athletes may participate in conditioning, weight-training and skill instruction in accordance with 17.1.5.2; and

"(b) Nonchampionship Segment Activities. During the segment in which the NCAA Championship does not occur, student-athletes may participate in any practice or competition activity as permitted by other legislation provided such activity is restricted to a maximum of 24 days that occur within a period of 45 calendar days. The 45 calendar days must be within the dates set forth in 17.11.5 and 17.11.6."

[17.11.7 through 17.11.8 renumbered as 17.11.9 through 17.11.10, unchanged.]

[Note: This proposal is presented in a nontraditional format. Appropriate revisions will be made in all relevant sections of Bylaw 17 affecting spring sports, except outdoor track and field (i.e., baseball, lacrosse, women's rowing, softball and tennis).]

- D. Bylaws: Amend 17.11.1 by adding new 17.11.1.1, pages 208-210, as follows:

[Division II, roll call]

"17.11.1.1 Exception. A member institution that

counts golf as a fall sport, per 3.2.4.10.1, may utilize the playing-season dates for fall sports and must follow out-of-season regulations for fall sports during the spring. The institution shall be eligible for the NCAA championship occurring in the spring."

[Note: Part D of this proposal applies only to the sports of golf and tennis.]

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Legislation Committee)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2002.

Rationale: The Legislation Committee spent considerable time discussing this concept as a way to significantly simplify Bylaw 17. Some of the most confusing legislation in this bylaw currently relates to start dates, calculation of practice opportunities, and dates, declaration of playing season segments and how to recoup lost days due to bad weather, among other issues. Although the committee agrees that this may not be a "win-win" situation for all sports, it is certainly an equitable solution to simplify current legislation and create legislation that is easy to interpret and that all institutions should be able to apply consistently to most sports. It also allows institutions more flexibility in determining nonchampionship-segment activities while not increasing out-of-season practice opportunities. Consequently, it alleviates concerns regarding time student-athletes currently spend in activities out-of-season and avoids possible future proposals to completely eliminate nonchampionship segment practice and competition. It is important to note that this does not affect winter sports (e.g., basketball and wrestling) and does not affect any sports which the only championship opportunity in a National Collegiate Championship. It also has no impact on outdoor track and field or emerging sports for women. The committee actually used the basketball "model" to some degree in creating this concept. It also considered the current legislation for football in creating the component of the concept dealing with out-of-season practice.

[Note: This proposal does not apply to any winter sport, any sport in which the only championship opportunity is a National Collegiate Championship, outdoor track and field, and all emerging sports for women.]

Action: Adopted.

***NO. 27 (NO. 2-29) (Dereg. No. 9) PLAYING AND PRACTICE
SEASONS - FOOTBALL
SPRING PRACTICE**

Intent: To eliminate the prohibition against Sunday practices during spring football.

Bylaws: Amend 17.10.6, page 207, as follows:
[Division II, roll call]

[17.10.6-(a) unchanged.]

"(b) Spring Practice. Fifteen postseason practice sessions (including intrasquad scrimmages and the spring game) are permissible, provided they are conducted within a period of 29 consecutive calendar days, omitting vacation and examination days officially announced on the institution's calendar and days during which the institution is closed due to inclement weather, *with no practices permitted on Sundays*. Any such practice sessions held during vacation days may not be of longer duration than those normally held when academic classes are in session. Only 12 of the 15 sessions may involve contact, and such contact shall not occur before the third practice session. The noncontact practice sessions may involve headgear as the only piece of protective equipment. Of the 12 permissible contact sessions, eight sessions may involve tackling, and no more than three of the eight tackling sessions may be devoted primarily (greater than 50 percent of practice time) to 11-on-11 scrimmages. Tackling shall be prohibited in four of the 12 contact sessions. An institution has the discretion to determine the practice activities (other than tackling) that may occur during the four contact nontackling sessions as well as the protective equipment to be worn by the student-athletes. If an institution conducts a "spring game" per Bylaw 17.10.5.2-(a), the game shall be counted as one of the three sessions that can be devoted primarily to 11-on-11 scrimmages. A student-athlete's participation in countable athletically related activities (see Bylaw 17.02.1.1) during the spring practice period shall be limited to a maximum of four hours per day and 20 hours per week."

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council (Management Council (Legislation Committee)).

Effective Date: August 1, 2002.

Rationale: The committee agreed that practice on Sunday should be an institutional decision and should not be legislated at the national level. Some institutions may wish to use some of the permissible 15 days on Sundays in order to avoid conflict with classes and labs. Further, it may be necessary to use a Sunday as one of the 15 days in situations when inclement weather causes practice cancellations and an institution is not able to complete the 15 days without applying to the NCAA Division II Administrative Review Subcommittee to extend the 29 day "window." An institution may adopt an institutional policy to prohibit countable athletically related activities on Sunday in football, or any other sport.

Action: Adopted, 128-7-0.

NO. 28 (NO. 2-16)

**ELIGIBILITY - SATISFACTORY-
PROGRESS - CORRESPONDENCE,
EXTENSION AND DISTANCE-
LEARNING COURSES**

Intent: To allow use of correspondence, extension and distance

learning courses to meet satisfactory-progress requirements, under specified conditions.

Bylaws: Amend 14.4.3.3.5, page 122, as follows:

[Division II]

"14.4.3.3.5 Correspondence and, Extension and Distance-Learning Courses from Another Institution. Correspondence, extension, distance-learning and credit-by-examination courses taken from an institution other than the one in which a student-athlete is enrolled as a full-time student *shall not* may be used in determining *a student's academic standing or satisfactory progress provided the course is taken at an accredited institution and the certifying institution accepts the course as transferable degree credit.*

"14.4.3.3.5.1 Waivers. Waivers of this restriction may be granted by the Academic Requirements Committee in response to written requests from member institutions.

"14.4.3.3.5.2 Centralized Correspondence-Course Exception. In a state that centralizes the offering of correspondence courses through one state institution, a student enrolled in another of the state's institutions may use a correspondence course from the institution authorized to offer such courses in determining the student's academic standing or satisfactory progress."

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Academic Requirements Committee)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2002.

Rationale: In an attempt to keep up with current trends in technology and to streamline continuing eligibility standards, the Academic Requirements Committee believes that the adoption of this proposal will allow student-athletes to take advantage of increased learning opportunities without compromising the integrity of higher education. This will allow student-athletes to utilize, for eligibility purposes, these types of courses taught via technology mediums just as they, and other students, use the courses to meet graduation requirements.

Action: Adopted, 154-82-6.

**NO. 29 (NO. 2-17) TWO-YEAR COLLEGE TRANSFERS -
ELIGIBILITY FOR PRACTICE -
PARTIAL QUALIFIERS**

Intent: To permit two-year college transfer student-athletes who were partial qualifiers to practice when transfer requirements for competition are not satisfied.

Bylaws: Amend 14.5.4.1.2, page 126, as follows:

[Division II]

"14.5.4.1.2 Partial Qualifier or Nonqualifier. A transfer student

from a two-year college who was *not a qualifier (per Bylaw 14.3.1) is eligible in Division II institutions for practice and competition (and for nonqualifiers, for athletics aid) a partial qualifier (per 14.3.1) is eligible for competition and a nonqualifier (per 14.3.1) is eligible for athletics aid, practice and competition* during the first academic year in residence only if the student has attended a two-year college as a full-time student for at least two semesters or three quarters and has:"

[14.5.4.1.2-(a) through 14.5.4.1.2-(b) unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Legislation Committee)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2002.

Rationale: Currently, it is not permissible for a two-year college transfer who was a partial qualifier to practice or compete when the individual transfers and does not meet the two-year college transfer requirements. However, an individual who is a partial qualifier and enters a Division II institution immediately after high-school graduation is allowed to practice (and receive aid). The Legislation Committee believes that when 1996 Convention Proposal No. 22 was adopted to allow incoming freshman who are partial qualifiers to practice, it likely was an oversight not to apply the same standard to two-year college transfers who were partial qualifiers but do not satisfy the requirements for competition at the time of transfer. Further, if it was not an oversight, the committee sees an advantage to such transfers being involved with the team during countable athletically related activities other than competition and travel. This should contribute to the student-athlete being successful academically and satisfying satisfactory-progress requirements during the initial year in residence.

Action: Adopted.

NO. 30 (NO. 2-8) AMATEURISM - PHOTOGRAPH SALES

Intent: To permit member institutions and conferences to contract with photographers to produce and sell photographs and videos to the general public.

Bylaws: Amend 12.5.1 by adding new 12.5.1.12, pages 65-68, as follows:

[12.5.1.1 through 12.5.1.11 unchanged]

[Division II]

"12.5.1.12 Sale of Photographs and Videos. A member conference or institution may permit photographers to produce photographs and videotapes of its athletics contests and banquets and permit those photographers to sell the work product directly to the public through advertising and on the photographer's Web site, provided the photographer has entered into an agreement with the confer-

once or institution and the conference or institution receives a full accounting of all sales generated."

Source: University of Alabama, Huntsville; Arkansas Tech University; University of Arkansas, Monticello; University of Central Arkansas; Christian Brothers University; Delta State University; Harding University; Henderson State University; Lincoln Memorial University; Mississippi University for Women; University of Montevallo; University of North Alabama; Ouachita Baptist University; Southern Arkansas University; Valdosta State University; University of West Alabama; University of West Florida; and State University of West Georgia.

Effective Date: August 1, 2002.

Rationale: Current legislation prohibits a member conference or member institution from licensing a photographer to produce photographs and videos at athletics contests and banquets and then advertise and sell the work product to the public. This burdens the member institution or conference with the responsibility of having to do all of the marketing, something most Division II conferences simply do not have the resources to do. This legislation would permit the photographer to take the photographs, advertise the service, display the available photographs and footage on the Web site of his or her choice, sell directly to the public, and the conference or institution may be paid its share after the purchases. The other restrictions in Bylaw 12.5.1 would still apply to prevent abuse.

Council/Committee Positions (Division II Presidents Council, Management Council and Legislation Committee): The Councils and committee oppose this proposal. It is currently permissible to sell photographs and videos in such a manner as a conference or institutional promotion per Bylaw 12.5.1.1 as long as an outside entity (third party) does not profit from such sales and is paid only actual expenses by the conference to produce the work product. Both Councils and the committee agreed not to support legislation that would allow third parties to begin to profit from the sale of photographs or videos of Division II student-athletes.

Action: Defeated.

RECRUITING

NO. 31 (NO. 2-9) RECRUITING - ADVERTISEMENTS

Intent: To permit institutions to place general institutional, summer-camp and summer-school advertisements in recruiting publications and high-school and two-year college game programs.

Bylaws: Amend 13.4.4.1, page 88, as follows:

[Division II]

"13.4.4.1 Recruiting Advertisements. The publication of advertising or promotional material, by or on behalf of a member in-

stitution, designed to solicit the enrollment of a prospective student-athlete is not permitted. Accordingly, a member institution may not buy or arrange to have space in game programs or other printed materials published to provide information concerning the athletics participation or evaluation of prospects (e.g., recruiting publications) *for any purpose whatsoever, including advertisements, a listing of prospective or enrolled student-athletes who will attend the institution and informative materials related to the institution. Violations of this bylaw shall be considered institutional violations per Constitution 2.8.1; however, they shall not affect the prospective student-athlete's eligibility, except under the following conditions:*

- "(a) Institutions may place advertisements in such publications for the purpose of advertising an institution's summer camp or clinic (including an athletically related camp or clinic);**
- "(b) Institutions may place general institutional advertisements (e.g., admissions advertisements) that are not athletically related and do not promote the institution's athletics program in such publications; and**
- "(c) Institutions may place advertisements for the purpose of advertising an institution's summer course offerings and/or class schedule in such publications.**

[13.4.4.1.1 unchanged.]

"13.4.4.1.2 Summer-Camp Advertisements. *Advertisements of an institution's summer camp or clinic in such recruiting publications are permissible if placed in a periodical (other than a high-school or two-year college game program) that includes a camp directory that meets the following requirements:*

- "(a) The size (not to exceed one-half page) and format of such advertisements must be identical; and**
- "(b) The camp directory must include multiple listings of summer camps on each page (i.e., at least two summer-camp advertisements of the same size must appear on each page).**

"13.4.4.1.2 Effect of Violations. *Violations of this bylaw shall be considered institutional violations per 2.8.1, however, the violation shall not affect the student-athlete's eligibility."*

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Legislation Committee)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2002.

Rationale: Currently, institutions are precluded from placing advertisements designed to solicit the enrollment of students in "recruiting publications." The application of the current rule is that if an athletics nexus exists on either "end" of the purchase, such advertisement is impermissible. For example, an institution may not place a gener-

al informational advertisement in a high-school athletics game program. Often, these advertisements are developed by the admissions office and space is purchased in game programs without the knowledge of the athletics department, which constitutes a violation. The Legislation Committee agreed that it should be permissible for institutions to put general (nonathletic) advertisements in game programs to solicit enrollment of students in general as well as to advertise summer-school courses and summer camps. Purchasing space for athletic advertisements or placing advertisements in publications other than those specified remains impermissible.

Action: Defeated, 117-123-1.

**NO. 32 (NO. 2-10) RECRUITING - INSTITUTIONAL
CONTROL**

Intent: To eliminate the requirement that funds expended for recruiting purposes must be deposited with the institution.

Bylaws: Amend 13.15.1, page 98, as follows:

[Division II]

"13.15.1 Institutional Control. All funds for the recruiting of prospects shall be deposited with the A member institution, which shall be exclusively and entirely responsible for the manner in which such institutional and personal funds are expended during the recruitment of prospective student-athletes."

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Legislation Committee)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2002.

Rationale: Current legislation requires all funds spent on recruiting to be deposited with the institution. This includes all personal funds expended by coaches. Currently it is not permissible for a coach to spend his or her own money, however minimal the amount, without claiming reimbursement from the institution or submitting a "gift-in-kind" with proper documentation detailing how the donation is being spent. The Legislation Committee agreed that this probably is the most violated rule in Division II and is not practical when it comes to how Division II institutions fund and manage recruiting efforts. This proposal states that all funds do not have to be deposited or documented with or by the institution, but the institution remains exclusively and entirely responsible for the manner in which institutional and personal funds are expended for recruiting purposes.

Action: Adopted.

**NO. 33 (NO. 2-11) RECRUITING - FOOTBALL
RECRUITING CALENDAR**

Intent: To revise the football recruiting calendar by changing the

Legislative Proposals _____

A-45

spring evaluation period to April 15 through May 31 and to specify that four weeks of evaluation is selected at the discretion of the institution.

Bylaws: Amend 30.11.3, pages 302-303, as follows:

"30.11.3 Football. The following contact and evaluation periods apply to football *in Division II*:

[30.11.3-(a) through 30.11.3-(d) unchanged.]

"(e) The 31st day after the Saturday after the Quiet Period
initial date for signing the National
Letter of Intent through *April 30 April 14*:

"(f) *May 1 April 15* through May 31 Evaluation Period
[except (g) below]:

"(1) Four weeks (excluding Memorial Day and Sundays) selected at the discretion of the member institution and designated in writing in the office of the director of athletics

"(g) Those days in April/May not designated Quiet Period
in (f) for evaluation opportunities;"

[30.11.3-(g) relettered as 30.11.3-(h) unchanged.]

Source: All members of the Mid-America Intercollegiate Athletics Association and all members of the Gulf South Conference.

Effective Date: Immediately.*

Rationale: Current legislation in Division I permits evaluations to begin April 15. Evaluations by Division II coaches may not begin until May 1. This difference results in two-year college scrimmages being conducted in late April at which Division II coaches are unable attend. This proposal does not extend the period of evaluation beyond the four weeks permitted in current legislation. This changes does, however, "level the field" by permitting Division II coaches to evaluate in the same time period as Division I.

Council/Committee Position (Division II Presidents Council, Management Council and Legislation Committee): The Councils and committee support this proposal.

Action: Adopted.

ELIGIBILITY

NO. 34 (NO. 2-12) ELIGIBILITY - SEASONS OF COMPETITION

Intent: To permit student-athletes, in the sports of women's volleyball, men's and women's soccer and women's field hockey to compete against outside competition in the nonchampionship segment without using a season of competition.

Bylaws: Amend 14.2.4.1 by adding new 14.2.4.1.2, pages 110-111, as follows:

[14.2.4.1.1 unchanged]

[Division II]

"14.2.4.1.2 Exception – Women's Volleyball, Field Hockey, Men's and Women's Soccer. A student-athlete may engage in outside competition during the segment of the playing season that does not conclude with the NCAA championship without using a season of competition, provided the student-athlete was academically eligible during the segment in the same academic year that concludes with the NCAA championship."

Source: All members of the Great Lakes Intercollegiate Athletic Conference and all members of the North Central Conference.

Effective Date: August 1, 2002.

Rationale: Under current legislation, a student-athlete who engages in any outside competition in a season is charged with a season of competition for that academic year. There is no difference between the championship segment and the nonchampionship segment. A "redshirted" student-athlete and a student-athlete who receives a medical hardship are not treated the same relative to their opportunity to compete during the nonchampionship segment. A "redshirted" student-athlete may continue to practice with the team but cannot compete, while a student-athlete who was granted a medical hardship may compete in the nonchampionship segment without using a season of competition. Therefore, "redshirted" student-athletes who were eligible to compete during the championship segment would be allowed the same opportunity as the student-athlete who receives a medical hardship during the championship segment. Typically, the nonchampionship segment is used for preparation for the next season, while the championship segment is the segment of emphasis.

Council/Committee Position (Division II Presidents Council, Management Council and Legislation Committee): The Councils and committee agreed to take no position on this proposal.

Action: Adopted.

**NO. 35 (NO. 2-13) ELIGIBILITY/SEASONS OF
COMPETITION — HARDSHIP
WAIVER**

Intent: To specify that a student-athlete's eligibility for a medical hardship should be determined by the number of scheduled contests or dates of competition rather than the number of completed contests or dates of competition.

Bylaws: Amend 14.2.5, pages 112-113, as follows:

[Division II]

"14.2.5 Hardship Waiver. A student-athlete may be granted an

additional year of competition by the conference or the *Academics/Eligibility/Compliance Cabinet Student-Athlete Reinstatement Committee* for reasons of "hardship." Hardship is defined as an incapacity resulting from an injury or illness that has occurred under all of the following conditions:

[14.2.5-(a) unchanged.]

"(b) The injury or illness occurs prior to the completion of the first half of the playing season that concludes with the NCAA championship in that sport (measured by the number of *completed scheduled* contests or dates of competition *rather than scheduled contests or dates of competition or calendar days as established prior to the first scheduled contest or date of competition, not to exceed the maximum limitations in each sport as specified in Bylaw 17*) and results in incapacity to compete for the remainder of that playing season; and

"(c) The injury or illness occurs when the student-athlete has not participated in more than two contests or dates of competition (whichever is applicable to that sport) or 20 percent (whichever number is greater) of the institution's *completed scheduled* contests or dates of competition in his or her sport. Only *scheduled* competition (excluding scrimmages and exhibition contests) against outside participants during the playing season that concludes with the NCAA championship, or, if so designated, during the official NCAA championship playing season in that sport (e.g., spring baseball, fall soccer), shall be countable under this limitation in calculating both the number of contests or dates of competition in which the student-athlete has participated and the number of *completed scheduled* contests or dates of competition during that season in the sport.

[14.2.5.1 through 14.2.5.1 unchanged.]

"14.2.5.2 Criteria for Administration of Hardship Waiver. The following criteria are to be employed in the administration of the hardship waiver:

[14.2.5.2.1 and 14.2.5.2.2 unchanged.]

"14.2.5.2.3 First-Half-of-Season Calculation. In determining if an injury or illness occurs in the first half of the season that concludes with the NCAA championship in a sport with an odd number of *scheduled* contests or dates of competition, the injury or illness must have occurred prior to the beginning of the *scheduled* varsity contest or date of competition that starts the second half of the season that concludes with the NCAA championship (e.g., an injury or illness occurring at any time after the beginning of the *scheduled* sixth game of an 11-game football schedule would be considered to be after the first half of the institution's season and would not qualify the student-athlete for a hardship waiver).

[14.2.5.2.4 unchanged.]

"14.2.5.2.5 Percent Calculation. The following requirements are to be met in determining the percent calculation under this waiver provision: (Note: The percent calculation requirements set forth in Bylaws 14.2.5 and 14.2.5.2.5 apply only to the waiver provisions of this section and do not apply to the maximum- and minimum-contests requirements in Bylaw 20.)

"14.2.5.2.5.1 Denominator in Percent Computation. The denominator in the institution's percent calculation shall be based on the institution's number of *completed scheduled* varsity contests or dates of competition [see Bylaw 14.2.5-(c)] as computed for playing and practice season purposes in Bylaw 17 for the applicable sport. (Note: Exempted events in Bylaw 17 are included in the percent calculation, except as provided in Bylaw 14.2.5.2.5.3.)

"14.2.5.2.5.2 Fraction in Percent Computation. The denominator in the institution's percent calculation shall be based on the institution's number of *completed scheduled* varsity contests or dates of competition [see Bylaw 14.2.5-(c)] as computed for playing and practice season purposes in Bylaw 17 for the applicable sport. (Note: Exempted events in Bylaw 17 are included in the percent calculation, except as provided in Bylaw 14.2.5.2.5.3.)

"14.2.5.2.5.3 Conference Championships. A conference championship shall be counted as one contest or date of competition in determining the institution's *completed scheduled* contests or dates of competition in that sport, regardless of the number of days or games involved in the championship. However, for purposes of this regulation, the calculation of *completed scheduled* contests or dates of competition in a particular season does not include postseason competition conducted subsequent to the completion of the institution's regular-season schedule and conference tournament.

"14.2.5.2.5.4 Transfer Student-Athletes. The calculation for percentage of *completed scheduled* contests or dates of competition for a transfer student-athlete may be based on the method that would be most beneficial to the student-athlete (i.e., the rule applicable to the division where the injury or illness occurred or the Division I rule)."

[14.2.5.2.6 unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Legislation Committee)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2002.

Rationale: The current hardship-waiver legislation (which measures the first half of the playing season by the number of completed contests or dates of competition rather than the number of scheduled contests or dates of competition) leaves injured student-athletes uncertain as to whether they will be granted a medical-hardship waiver until the end of the playing season. The proposed change would provide injured student-athletes with more certainty as to the outcome of a medical-hardship waiver. Additionally, measuring the first half of the playing season by the number of scheduled contests (as established prior to the first scheduled contest or date of competition) will eliminate inequitable results that occur when games are cancelled due to circumstances beyond the control of the institution or student-athlete. Measuring the first half of the playing season in this manner also will eliminate the need for hastily arranged make-up games.

Action: Adopted.

PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS

NO. 36 (NO. 2-23) PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS - WEEKLY HOUR LIMITATIONS - FOOTBALL

Intent: In the sport of football, to permit student-athletes to view a maximum of two hours of game film per week as part of the permissible eight hours of required weight-training and conditioning activities that may occur during the academic year outside of the playing season.

Bylaws: Amend 17.1.5.2, page 181, as follows:

[Division II]

"17.1.5.2 Weekly Hour Limitations - Outside of Playing Season. Outside of the playing season during the academic year, only a student-athlete's participation in the countable athletically related activities specified in 17.02.1-(c), 17.02.1-(d), and 17.02.1-(e) and in the sport of football, Bylaw 17.02.1-(a)-(6) shall be permitted. A student-athlete's participation in such activities shall be limited to a maximum of eight hours per week, of which not more than two hours per week may be spent on individual skill workouts set forth in 17.02.1-(e) and 17.1.5.2.1, and in the sport of football, the viewing of game film per Bylaw 17.02.1-(a)-(6). A student-athlete may not participate in any countable athletically related activities outside the playing season during any institutional vacation period (e.g., summer, academic year)."

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Legislation Committee)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2002.

Rationale: Currently, student-athletes in the sport of football are the only student-athletes excluded from the skill-instruction opportunities outside the playing season during the academic year. The opportunity to view a maximum of two hours of game film with the coaching staff as part of the eight hours of permissible weekly conditioning is a good alternative to actual skill-related instruction. This proposed change does not increase the time for out-of-season activities; it simply permits another type of activity during that time.

Action: Adopted.

**NO. 37 (NO. 2-30) PRESEASON PRACTICE START
DATE - GOLF**

Intent: To specify that an institution that is a member of a conference that conducts its only conference championship or plays the majority of its conference matches in golf during the fall may commence practice August 24 or the first day of classes, whichever is earlier.

Bylaws: Amend 17.11.2 by adding new 17.11.2.1, page 208, as follows:

[Division II]

"17.11.2.1 Exception. An institution that is a member of a conference that conducts its only conference championship or plays the majority of its conference matches during the fall may commence practice August 24 or the institution's first day of classes, whichever is earlier."

Source: All members of the Great Lakes Valley Conference and Great Lakes Intercollegiate Athletic Conference.

Effective Date: August 1, 2002.

Rationale: When legislation was adopted at the 1997 NCAA Convention, to establish September 7 or the institution's first day of class as the date when preseason practice in the sport of golf can commence, there was no consideration for those conferences that conduct their only conference championship in the fall. This exception would not penalize those institutions that begin classes on or after September 7.

Council/Committee Position (Division II Presidents Council, Management Council and Legislation Committee): The Councils and committee support this proposal.

Action: Adopted, 125-77-29.

**NO. 38 (NO. 2-31) FIRST DATE OF COMPETITION -
GOLF**

Intent: To specify that an institution that is a member of a conference that conducts its only conference championship, or plays the majority of its conference matches in golf during the fall may conduct its first contest or practice match with outside competition September 1 or the preceding Friday of September 1 falls on a Saturday or Sunday.

Bylaws: Amend 17.11.3 by adding new 17.11.3.1, page 210, as follows:

[Division II]

"17.11.3.1 Exception. An institution that is a member of a conference that conducts its only conference championship or plays the majority of its conference matches during the fall may conduct its first contest or practice match with outside competition September 1 or the preceding Friday if September 1 falls on a Saturday or Sunday."

Source: All members of the Great Lakes Valley Conference and Great Lakes Intercollegiate Athletic Conference.

Effective Date: August 1, 2002.

Rationale: In some areas of the country, it is more advantageous to conduct conference championships in golf during the fall. An earlier start to the season would allow the schedule to be completed before the inclement weather occurs.

Council/Committee Position (Division II Presidents Council, Management Council and Legislation Committee): The Councils and committee support this proposal.

Action: Adopted.

GENERAL

NO. 39 (NO. 2-38)

COMMITTEES - DIVISION II STUDENT-ATHLETE ADVISORY COMMITTEE - VACANCIES

Intent: To increase the number of nominations required to be submitted by Division II conferences from two to four for vacancies on the national Student-Athlete Advisory Committee.

Constitution: Amend 21.6.6.8.2, page 291, as follows:

[Division II]

"21.6.6.8.2 Vacancies. When a vacancy on the committee occurs, the applicable conferences shall nominate *two at least four* student-athletes, each from different active member institutions in the conference. Nominations for the independent position and at-large positions will be solicited by the Division II Nominating Committee. Giving due weight to gender and ethnic diversity, as well as diversity by sports participation, student-athlete representatives shall be selected by the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee from the slate of nominees, subject to ratification by the Division II Management Council and Presidents Council."

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Student-Athlete Advisory Committee)].

Effective Date: Immediately.*

Rationale: To accomplish its goal of greater committee diversity, the Division II Student-Athlete Advisory Committee seeks to increase the pool of candidates for consideration. This change will assist in gender, ethnicity and sport diversity. Further, conferences will have the ability to solicit more interest from student-athletes in the conference and not be limited to selecting only two from the pool of those who express an interest.

Action: Adopted.

DIVISION III LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS

The NCAA Division III Presidents Council has determined that it will deal primarily with those national issues in Division III athletics that prompt widespread concern among Division III chief executive officers.

Legislative proposals developed by the Division III Management Council or by Division III committees reporting to it must be submitted to the Division III Presidents Council for review. They cannot be placed on the agenda for consideration at the Convention unless the Presidents Council agrees to sponsor them. This procedure was established to affirm presidential control of intercollegiate athletics in Division III.

The Division III Presidents Council has identified those proposals that it believes are of particular interest to Division III chief executive officers and has included them in the Presidents Council grouping. It should be noted, however, that inclusion of proposals in the Presidents Council grouping does not necessarily constitute a position by the Division III Presidents Council for or against a proposal. Those proposals with an asterisk before the proposal number have been identified by the Presidents Council as roll-call votes. Delegates should refer to each proposal's source line for information regarding the sponsor of each proposal.

Pursuant to Constitution 5.3.13, all amendments shall become effective not earlier than the first day of August following adoption at the NCAA Convention; however, if a voting delegate wishes to propose an immediate effective date, or to propose any other effective date before the first day of August, the proposal rationale statement shall contain reasons for the alternate effective date.

PRESIDENTS COUNCIL GROUPING

*NO. 40 (NO. 2-50) ELIGIBILITY - SEASONS OF COMPETITION

Intent: To specify that an individual who does not enroll full-time in a collegiate institution during the academic term immediately following graduation of the individual's high-school class shall lose a

season of competition during each calendar year or sport season in which the individual participates in outside competition; further, to require such an individual to fulfill an academic year in residency upon initial enrollment at an Division III institution.

Bylaws: Amend 14.2.4 by adding new 14.2.4.3, page 96, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

"14.2.4.3 Participation in Organized Competition Prior to Initial Collegiate Enrollment. An individual who does not enroll in a collegiate institution as a full-time student during the regular academic term that is immediately subsequent to the date that the individual's high-school class normally graduates from high school (or the international equivalent as specified in the NCAA Guide to International Academic Standards for Athletics Eligibility) or discontinues full-time high-school enrollment shall utilize a season of intercollegiate competition for each calendar year or sport season (subsequent to that date) in which the individual has participated in activities that meet the criteria set forth in 14.2.4.3.2.

"14.2.4.3.1 Academic Year in Residence. An individual who uses a season(s) of competition per 14.2.4.3 shall fulfill an academic year in residence prior to being eligible to represent the institution in intercollegiate competition.

"14.2.4.3.2 Activities Constituting Use of Season. An individual shall utilize a season of competition per 14.2.4.3 if the individual participates in activities that meet any of the following criteria:

"(a) Any team competition or training in which pay in any form is provided to any of the participants above actual and necessary expenses;

"(b) Any individual competition or training in which the individual accepts pay in any form based on his or her place finish or any competition or training in which the individual accepts pay in any form above actual and necessary expenses;

"(c) Any competition pursuant to the signing of a contract for athletics participation or entering a professional draft; or

"(d) Any competition funded by a representative of an institution's athletics interest that is not open to all participants.

"14.2.4.3.2.1 Competition Exceptions. The following activities would not constitute a season of competition per 14.2.4.3.2:

"(a) Preparatory School. Participation in organized competition while enrolled in a post-graduate college preparatory school shall be

exempted. This exception may only be used during the initial year of enrollment in the preparatory school; and

"(b) Athletics Activity Exception. A maximum one-time one-year exception for participation in the following activities:

"(1) Official Pan American, World Championships, World Cup, World University and Olympic training, tryouts and competition;

"(2) Officially recognized training and competition directly qualifying participants for final Olympic tryouts; or

"(3) Official tryouts and competition involving national teams sponsored by the appropriate national governing bodies of the U.S. Olympic Committee (or for student-athletes representing another nation, the equivalent organization of that nation, or for student-athletes competing in a non-Olympic sport, the equivalent organization of that sport."

[14.2.4.3 through 14.2.4.5 renumbered as 14.2.4.4 through 14.2.4.6, unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Division III Presidents Council [Management Council (Amateurism Task Force)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2002; for those student-athletes first entering a collegiate institution full time on or after August 1, 2002.

Rationale: This proposal focuses on the period between high-school graduation and initial collegiate enrollment and recognizes that participation in a high level of competition during this time may result in a competitive advantage. Thus, the loss of season(s) of competition as a consequence for choosing to engage in such activity would lessen the competitive advantage and foster a level playing field among member institutions. Further, the requirement that an individual fulfill an academic year in residence after full-time enrollment will ensure that an appropriate commitment to academics is being made. Also, in order to minimize the possibility of a prospect avoiding the application of the legislation by intentionally delaying high-school graduation, the legislation becomes effective with the expected graduation date of his or her high-school class. Similarly, the organized competition rule will apply to any prospect who intentionally discontinues high-school to compete in organized competition in his or her sport. Some individuals choose to enroll in a postgraduate, college preparatory school prior to initial collegiate enrollment. This activity should be exempted from the application of the proposed seasons of competition rule inasmuch as this activity is connected to an academic

pursuit. Participation in certain elite skill level events such as the Olympics and Pan American Games also should be exempted. The exceptions would be administered by the institution with the required documentation kept on file in the athletics department. Although this proposal addresses an individual's participation in organized competition after the summer following high-school graduation. It differs from the current definition of organized competition, which applies to very low levels of competition (such as church, recreational or YMCA leagues). This type of activity does not provide for a significant competitive advantage and should not result in the loss of seasons of competition. The current definition of organized competition would remain in place for all other purposes.

Action: Adopted, 291-46-4.

***NO. 41 (NO. 2-47) AMATEURISM - PRIZE MONEY BASED
ON PLACE FINISH**

Intent: To permit an individual prior to initial full-time collegiate enrollment to accept prize money based on place finish from the sponsor of an open athletics event, the United States Olympic Committee or the appropriate national governing body.

A. Bylaws: Amend 12.1.1, pages 55-56, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

"12.1.1 Amateur Status. An individual loses amateur status and thus shall not be eligible for intercollegiate competition in a particular sport if the individual:

"(a) Uses his or her athletics skill (directly or indirectly) for pay in any form in that sport, **except that prior to collegiate enrollment an individual may accept prize money based on his or her place finish or performance from the sponsor of an open athletics event, the United States Olympic Committee or the appropriate national governing body;**"

[12.1.1-(b) through 12.1.1-(f) unchanged.]

B. Bylaws: Amend 12.1.1.4.1, page 56, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

"12.1.1.4.1 Cash or Equivalent Award. **Subsequent to initial full-time collegiate enrollment,** Cash, or the equivalent thereof (e.g., trust fund), as an award for his or her place finish or performance from the sponsor of an open athletics event the United States Olympic Committee or the appropriate national governing body. An award or a cash prize that an individual could not receive under NCAA legislation may not be forwarded in the individual's name to a different individual or agency."

C. Bylaws: Amend 12.1.1.5, page 57, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

"12.1.1.1.5 Payment Based on Performance. Subsequent to initial full-time collegiate enrollment, Any payment, including actual and necessary expenses, conditioned on the individual's or team's place finish or performance or given on an incentive basis, or receipt of expenses in excess of the same reasonable amount for permissible expenses given to all individuals or team members involved in the competition."

D. Bylaws: Amend 12.1.1.3, page 57, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

"12.1.1.3 Road Racing. "Road racing" is essentially the same as cross country or track and field competition and cannot be separated effectively from those sports for purposes of Bylaw 12. Therefore, subsequent to full-time collegiate enrollment, an student-athlete individual who accepts pay in any form for participation in such a race is ineligible for intercollegiate cross country or track and field competition."

E. Bylaws: Amend 14.2.4 by adding new 14.2.4.3, page 96, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

"14.2.4.3 Participation in Organized Competition Prior to Initial Collegiate Enrollment. An individual who does not enroll in a collegiate institution as a full-time student from the date of the next opportunity for collegiate enrollment after high-school graduation (or the international equivalent as specified in the NCAA Guide to International Academic Standards for Athletics Eligibility) or discontinues full-time high-school enrollment shall use a season of intercollegiate competition for each calendar year or sport season (subsequent to that date) in which the individual has participated in activities that meet the criteria set forth in 14.2.4.3.2.

"14.2.4.3.1 Academic Year in Residence. An individual who uses a season(s) of competition per 14.2.4.3 shall fulfill an academic year in residence prior to being eligible to represent the institution in intercollegiate competition.

"14.2.4.3.2 Activities Constituting Use of Season. An individual shall use a season of competition per 14.2.4.3 if the individual participates in activities that meet any of the following criteria:

"(a) Any team competition or training in which pay in any form is provided to any of the participants above actual and necessary expenses;

"(b) Any individual competition or training in which the individual accepts pay in any form based on his or her place finish or any competition or training in which the individual accepts pay in

any form above actual and necessary expenses;

"(c) Any competition pursuant to the signing of a contract for athletics participation or entering a professional draft; or

"(d) Any competition funded by a representative of an institution's athletics interest that is not open to all participants.

"14.2.4.3.2.1 Competition Exceptions. The following activities would not constitute a season of competition per 14.2.4.3.2:

"(a) Preparatory School. Participation in organized competition while enrolled in a post-graduate college preparatory school shall be exempted. This exception may only be used during the initial year of enrollment in the preparatory school; and

"(b) Athletics Activity Exception. A maximum one-time one-year exception for participation in the following activities:

"(1) Official Pan American, World Championships, World Cup, World University and Olympic training, tryouts and competition;

"(2) Officially recognized training and competition directly qualifying participants for final Olympic tryouts; or

"(3) Official tryouts and competition involving national teams sponsored by the appropriate national governing bodies of the U.S. Olympic Committee (or for student-athletes representing another nation, the equivalent organization of that nation, or for student-athletes competing in a non-Olympic sport, the equivalent organization of that sport."

[14.2.4.3 through 14.2.4.5 renumbered as 14.2.4.4 through 14.2.4.6, unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Division III Presidents Council [Management Council (Amateurism Task Force)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2002; for those student-athletes first entering a collegiate institution full time on or after August 1, 2002.

Rationale: The acceptance of prize money or other forms of compensation based on a prospective student-athlete's place finish should be permissible. Money does not provide a prospect with a competitive advantage. To the contrary, the acceptance of money alone is a poor indicator when evaluating a prospective student-athlete's appropriateness for intercollegiate athletics. It is

grossly unfair to require prospective student-athletes (sometimes at the very young ages of 14 and 15) to decline prize money because of the possibility of participating in intercollegiate athletics in the future. Current NCAA legislation allows for competition against professionals where prize money could be accepted and therefore, allowing a prospect to accept prize money in no way changes the current pool of recruitable Division III prospects. Further, current amateurism rules are confusing and intrusive, and by allowing prospects to accept prize money, prospects can make decisions that are in their individual best interests. Finally, the mere acceptance of prize money does not render a prospective student-athlete inappropriate for our intercollegiate programs and maintains the Association's commitment to prospective student-athlete welfare. The deregulation of portions of Bylaw 12 may result in some prospects participating in events in which prize money may be received. However, the season of competition proposal mitigates the competitive advantage gained through any competition in which prize money is received and preserves competitive equity.

Action: Adopted, 297-45-0.

***NO. 42 (NO. 2-44) AMATEURISM - COMPETITION
WITH PROFESSIONALS**

Intent: To permit an individual prior to initial full-time collegiate enrollment to participate on a professional team without jeopardizing intercollegiate eligibility.

A. Bylaws: Amend 12.1.1, pages 55-56, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

"12.1.1 Amateur Status. An individual loses amateur status and thus shall not be eligible for intercollegiate competition in a particular sport if the individual:

[12.1.1-(a) through 12.1.1-(d) unchanged.]

"(e) **Subsequent to initial full-time collegiate enrollment,** Competes on any professional athletics team and knows (or had reason to know) that the team is a professional athletics team (per 12.02.4), even if no pay or remuneration for expenses was received; or"

[12.1.1-(f) unchanged.]

B. Bylaws: Amend 12.2.1, page 59, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

"12.2.1.1 Tryout Prior to Enrollment. A student-athlete remains eligible in a sport even though, prior to enrollment in a collegiate institution, the student-athlete may have tried out with a professional athletics team in a sport or received not more than one expense-paid visit from each professional

team (or a combine including that team), provided such a visit did not exceed 48 hours and any payment or compensation in connection with the visit was not in excess of actual and necessary expenses. A self-financed tryout may be for any length of time."

C. Bylaws: Amend 12.2.2, page 59, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

"12.2.2 Practice Without Competition. Subsequent to initial full-time collegiate enrollment, Aan individual may participate in practice sessions conducted by a professional team, provided such participation meets the requirements of NCAA legislation governing tryouts with professional athletics teams (see 12.2.1) and the individual does not."

[12.2.2-(a) through 12.2.2-(c) unchanged.]

D. Bylaws: Amend 12.2.3.2, page 59, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

"12.2.3.2 Competition with Professionals. Subsequent to initial full-time collegiate enrollment, Aan individual shall not be eligible for intercollegiate athletics in a sport if the individual ever participated on a team and knew (or had reason to know) that the team was a professional team (per 12.02.4) in that sport. However, an individual may compete on a tennis, golf, two-person sand volleyball or two-person synchronized diving teams with persons who are competing for cash or a comparable prize, provided the individual does not receive payment of any kind for such participation.

"12.2.3.2.1 Professional Player as Team Member. Subsequent to initial full-time collegiate enrollment, Aan individual may participate with a professional on a team, provided the professional is not being paid by a professional team or league to play as a member of that team (e.g., summer basketball leagues with teams composed of both professional and amateur athletes).

[12.2.3.2.2 unchanged.]

"12.2.3.2.3 Amateur/Professional Leagues. Subsequent to initial full-time enrollment, Aan individual may participate as a member of an amateur team in a league in which one or more teams are professional, provided the league is not a member of a recognized professional sports organization or is not directly supported or sponsored by a professional sports team or organization."

[12.2.3.2.4 unchanged.]

E. Bylaws: Amend 14.2.4 by adding a new 14.2.4.3, page 96, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

"14.2.4.3 Participation in Organized Competition Prior to Initial Collegiate Enrollment. An individual who does not enroll in a collegiate institution as a full-time student during the regular academic term that is immediately subsequent to the date that the individual's high-school class normally graduates from high-school (or the international equivalent as specified in the NCAA Guide to International Academic Standards for Athletics Eligibility) or discontinues full-time high-school enrollment shall use a season of intercollegiate competition for each calendar year or sport season (subsequent to that date) in which the individual has participated in activities that meet the criteria set forth in 14.2.4.3.2.

"14.2.4.3.1 Academic Year in Residence. An individual who uses a season(s) of competition per 14.2.4.3 shall fulfill an academic year in residence prior to being eligible to represent the institution in intercollegiate competition.

"14.2.4.3.2 Activities Constituting Use of Season. An individual shall use a season of competition per 14.2.4.3 if the individual participates in activities that meet any of the following criteria:

- "(a)** Any team competition or training in which pay in any form is provided to any of the participants above actual and necessary expenses;
- "(b)** Any individual competition or training in which the individual accepts pay in any form based on his or her place finish or any competition or training in which the individual accepts pay in any form above actual and necessary expenses;
- "(c)** Any competition pursuant to the signing of a contract for athletics participation or entering a professional draft; or
- "(d)** Any competition funded by a representative of an institution's athletics interest that is not open to all participants.

"14.2.4.3.2.1 Competition Exceptions. The following activities would not constitute a season of competition per 14.2.4.3.2:

- "(a)** Preparatory School. Participation in organized competition while enrolled in a post-graduate college preparatory school shall be exempted. This exception may only be used during the initial year of enrollment in the preparatory school; and
- "(b)** Athletics Activity Exception. A maximum one-time one-year exception for participation in the following activities:

"(1) Official Pan American, World Championships, World Cup, World University and Olympic training, tryouts and competition;

"(2) Officially recognized training and competition directly qualifying participants for final Olympic tryouts; or

"(3) Official tryouts and competition involving national teams sponsored by the appropriate national governing bodies of the U.S. Olympic Committee (or for student-athletes representing another nation, the equivalent organization of that nation, or for student-athletes competing in a non-Olympic sport, the equivalent organization of that sport."

[14.2.4.3 through 14.2.4.5 renumbered as 14.2.4.4 through 14.2.4.6, unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Division III Presidents Council [Management Council (Amateurism Task Force)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2002; for those student-athletes first entering a collegiate institution full time on or after August 1, 2002.

Rationale: Currently, competition against professionals is permissible while competition with professionals is not permissible. This allows individual sport participants to participate at a professional level while maintaining their amateur status; however, team sport participants do not have this opportunity inasmuch as they cannot participate with professionals and maintain amateur status. This disadvantages team sport participants. It is important to distinguish between acts that do not impact competitive equity and participation in activities that result in a competitive advantage. The deregulation of portions of Bylaw 12 may result in some prospects participating on a professional team. However, the season of competition proposal mitigates the competitive advantages and preserves competitive equity. In this instance, the prospect must choose between participation on a professional team and enrollment in a collegiate institution with the legislation clearly delineating the eligibility consequences. The proposals do not allow for prospective student-athletes to accept compensation or to have an agent. Therefore, individuals who have truly professionalized themselves will be ineligible.

Action: Adopted, 298-49-1.

***NO. 43 (NO. 2-46) AMATEURISM - CONTRACTUAL AGREEMENT**

Intent: To permit an individual prior to initial full-time collegiate enrollment to sign a contract or commitment of any kind to par-

participate in professional athletics without jeopardizing intercollegiate eligibility.

A. Bylaws: Amend 12.1.1, pages 55-56, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

"12.1.1 Amateur Status. An individual loses amateur status and thus shall not be eligible for intercollegiate competition in a particular sport if the individual:

[12.1.1-(a) through 12.1.1-(b) unchanged.]

"(c) Subsequent to initial full-time collegiate enrollment, Signs a contract or commitment of any kind to play professional athletics, regardless of its legal enforceability or any consideration received;"

[12.1.1-(d) through 12.1.1-(f) unchanged.]

B. Bylaws: Amend 12.2.5.1, page 60, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

"12.2.5.1 General Rule. Subsequent to initial full-time collegiate enrollment, An individual shall be ineligible for participation in an intercollegiate sport if he or she has entered into any kind of agreement to compete in professional athletics, either orally or in writing, regardless of the legal enforceability of that agreement.

"12.2.5.1.1 Nonbinding Agreements. Subsequent to initial full-time enrollment, An individual who signs a contract or commitment that does not become binding until the professional organization's representative or agent also signs the document is ineligible, even if the contract remains unsigned by the other parties until after the student-athlete's eligibility is exhausted."

Source: NCAA Division III Presidents Council (Management Council (Amateurism Task Force)).

Effective Date: August 1, 2002; for those student-athletes first entering a collegiate institution full time on or after August 1, 2002.

Rationale: The act of signing a contract does not necessarily yield any competitive advantage for prospective student-athletes and, therefore, should not jeopardize an individual's NCAA eligibility. Division III reinstatement case precedent exists where individuals prior to collegiate enrollment have made a poor decision by signing a professional contract and, thus, jeopardized their collegiate eligibility. The condition of permanent ineligibility is too harsh for an action that creates no competitive advantage. It should be noted that the prohibition against the use of an agent would remain applicable and would continue to jeopardize the eligibility of any individual who agrees (orally or in writing) for such representation.

Action: Adopted, 301-42-0.

***NO. 44 (NO. 2-48) AMATEURISM - PROFESSIONAL
DRAFT**

Intent: To permit an individual prior to initial full-time collegiate enrollment to enter a professional league's draft and/or be drafted without jeopardizing intercollegiate eligibility.

A. Bylaws: Amend 12.1.1, pages 55-56, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

"12.1.1 Amateur Status. An individual loses amateur status and thus shall not be eligible for intercollegiate competition in a particular sport if the individual:

[12.1.1-(a) through 12.1.1-(d) unchanged.]

"(e) Competes on any professional athletics team and knows (or had reason to know) that the team is a professional athletics team (per 12.02.4), even if no pay or remuneration for expenses was received; or

"(f) Subsequent to initial full-time collegiate enrollment, Enters into a professional draft (see also 12.2.4.2.1); or

"(g) Enters into an agreement with an agent."

B. Bylaws: Amend 12.2.4.2, page 60, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

"12.2.4.2 Draft List. Subsequent to initial full-time collegiate enrollment, An individual loses amateur status in a particular sport when the individual asks to be placed on the draft list or supplemental draft list of a professional league in that sport, even though:"

[12.2.4.2-(a) through 12.2.4.2-(c) unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Division III Presidents Council [Management Council (Amateurism Task Force)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2002; for those student-athletes first entering a collegiate institution full time on or after August 1, 2002.

Rationale: The act of placing a name on a draft list or being drafted, similar to the act of signing a professional contract, does not necessarily yield any competitive advantage for prospective student-athletes and, therefore, should not jeopardize a prospect's NCAA eligibility. It should be noted that the prohibition against the use of an agent would remain applicable and would continue to jeopardize the eligibility of any individual who agrees (orally or in writing) for such representation.

Action: Adopted, 307-26-4.

***NO. 45 (NO. 2-41) MEMBERSHIP - PROVISIONAL
MEMBERSHIP**

Intent: To require provisional members to meet specified require-
A-64 _____ *Legislative Proposals*

ments as part of the provisional membership program and pay an educational fee established by the Membership Committee and approved by the Management Council.

A. Constitution: Amend 3.6.1, pages 16-17, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

"3.6.1 Eligibility

[3.6.1.1 through 3.6.1.2 unchanged.]

"3.6.1.2.1 Four-Year Progression. Unless specified otherwise in Constitution 3.6, During the first and second years of provisional membership, an institution shall apply the legislation of the Association to the greatest extent possible. During the third and fourth years of provisional membership, an institution shall administer its athletics program in accordance with the constitution, bylaws and other legislation of the Association. The third and fourth years of provisional membership must be completed consecutively. Each provisional member must complete the provisional member education program prior to being granted active membership.

[3.6.1.2.1.1 unchanged.]

"3.6.1.2.1.2 Athletically Related Financial Aid Prohibition. A provisional member shall not award new athletically related financial aid to incoming students (e.g., freshmen, transfers) beginning with the second first year of provisional membership and thereafter. Following the completion of year two, a provisional member may no longer award athletically related financial aid to any student. Prior to the fourth year of provisional membership (and each subsequent year), a provisional member must complete the Division III financial aid audit.

[3.6.1.2.2 through 3.6.1.3 unchanged.]

"3.6.1.5 Five-Sport/Three-Season Requirement-Division III. At the time of application, a provisional member must have at least five sports for each gender, three of which must be team sports (per Bylaw 17). In addition, a provisional member must sponsor at least one sport per season (e.g., fall, winter, spring). After two one years of provisional membership, the institution shall sponsor and conduct a representative schedule in a minimum of four five varsity intercollegiate sports that involve all-male teams or mixed teams of males and females and four five varsity intercollegiate sports that involve all-female teams, subject to the requirements of the institution's conference(s), if any. An institution may use a sport to meet the three-season requirement only if the institution has met the minimum contest and participants requirements for sports sponsorship in that sport as set forth in Bylaw 20.11.3.2.

"3.6.1.5.1 Second, Third and Fourth Years of Provisional Membership. Provisional members entering the second, third and fourth years of provisional membership shall meet all requirements for sports sponsorship as set forth in Bylaw 20.11.3.2. **Following the completion of year two, a provisional member may no longer award athletically related financial aid to any student. Prior to the fourth year of provisional membership (and each subsequent year), a provisional member must complete the Division III financial aid audit."**

B. Constitution: Amend 3.6.3, page 17, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

"3.6.3 Election Procedures.

[3.6.3.1 unchanged.]

"3.6.3.2 Application. An institution desiring to become a provisional member of this Association **must complete a one year "exploratory period" prior to application and attend a required information meeting in conjunction with the NCAA annual Convention. The applicant institution must register with the national office in order to start this period. Following the completion period, the applicant shall apply on a form available from the national office. An application fee in the amount of \$2,500 shall accompany the application form. In addition, a check in the appropriate amount for annual dues (see the current annual dues for active members per Constitution 3.7.3) also shall accompany the application. Should the applicant fail to qualify academically or fail election, the dues paid shall be refunded. Each provisional member must pay an educational fee as determined by the Membership Committee and approved by the Management Council for the provisional membership process. One-half must accompany the application. The remainder of the education fee must be paid at the start of year three. In addition, provisional members must also pay the appropriate amount for annual dues each year.**

[3.6.3.3 unchanged.]

"3.6.3.4 Election. *A favorable vote by two-thirds of the Management Council members present and voting shall elect the applicant to provisional membership effective the following September 1. When the vote of the Management Council has been completed, the applicant shall be notified. The annual class of provisional members shall be limited to a maximum of six schools selected in accordance with the process determined by the Membership Committee and approved by the Management Council."*

C. Constitution: Amend 3.6.4, pages 17-18, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

"3.6.4 Conditions and Obligations of Membership.

"3.6.4.1 General. Unless specified otherwise in Constitution 3.6, Dduring the first and second years of the four-year provisional membership, an institution shall apply the legislation of the Association to the greatest extent possible. During the third and fourth years of provisional membership, an institution shall administer its athletics program in accordance with the constitution, bylaws and other legislation of the Association. **Each provisional member must complete the provisional member education program prior to being granted active membership."**

"3.6.4.1.1 Athletically Related Financial Aid Prohibition. A provisional member shall not award new athletically related financial aid to incoming students (e.g., freshmen, transfers) beginning with the second first year of provisional membership and thereafter. Following the completion of year two, a provisional member may no longer award athletically related financial aid to any student. Prior to the fourth year of provisional membership (and each subsequent year), a provisional member must complete the Division III financial aid audit.

[3.6.4.2 and 3.6.4.3 unchanged.]

"3.6.4.4 Compliance Period. Following the institution's second year of provisional membership, a provisional member shall fulfill the conditions and obligations applicable to active members per Constitution 3.2.4.3 through 3.2.4.13, except that the waivers described in Constitution 3.2.4.11.5 and 3.2.4.11.6 shall not apply. Following the completion of year one, a provisional member must appoint a faculty athletics representative in accordance with Constitution 6.1.3 and a student-athlete advisory committee in accordance with Constitution 6.1.4. Following the completion of year two, a provisional member must administer the Division III rules test to its coaching staff members."

[3.6.4.5 unchanged.]

D. Constitution: Amend 3.7.3.1, pages 18-19, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

"3.7.3.1 Application Fee-Provisional Members. Provisional members shall pay a nonrefundable \$2,500 application educational fee determined by the Membership Committee and approved by the Management Council in addition to the payment of annual dues. One-half must accompany the application. The remainder of the education fee must be paid at the start of year three. In addition, provisional members must also pay the appropriate amount for annual dues each year."

Source: NCAA Division III Presidents Council [Management Council (Membership Committee)].

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: The current membership moratorium was adopted to provide each division the opportunity to evaluate its current provisional membership education program. The Membership Committee and governance structure have spent a great amount of time reviewing the current provisional membership process. This proposal represents the results of those discussions. These recommendations would solidify the provisional membership process. In addition, these requirements will require institutions to make a firm commitment to two founding principles of Division III active membership – sports sponsorship and financial aid requirements – before beginning the provisional membership process. These requirements also will help address issues of membership growth. The “exploratory period” and required information meeting would provide an opportunity for institutions to learn the details of the provisional membership process before application. The immediate effective date is necessary in order to apply these standards to the initial post-moratorium provisional membership class. Based on the revised provisional membership education program, the initial education fee will be \$12,000 with one-half due at the start of year one and one-half due at the start of year three. A random selection process will be used to determine which schools will make up each class of six schools. The first six schools will make up the first class with the next schools making up the second class. This process will continue until all eligible applying schools have been “slotted” for a date to start their provisional membership.

Action: Adopted, 273-62-5.

**NO. 45-1 MEMBERSHIP - PROVISIONAL
MEMBERSHIP - EXCEPTION**

Intent: To exempt an institution from the exploratory period and random selection process required of provisional member applicants provided the institution has been accepted for membership in a Division III voting conference as of December 31, 2001, and meets all other specified requirements (e.g., sport sponsorship and financial aid) to be eligible for provisional membership.

Constitution: Amend Proposal No. 45, part B, 3.6.3.2 as follows:
[Division III, roll call]

“3.6.3 Election Procedures.

[3.6.3.1 unchanged.]

“3.6.3.2 Application. An institution desiring to become a provisional member of this Association must complete a one year “exploratory period” prior to application and attend a required information meeting in conjunction with the NCAA

annual Convention. The applicant institution must register with the national office in order to start this period. Following the completion period, the applicant shall apply on a form available from the national office. Each provisional member must pay an educational fee as determined by the Membership Committee and approved by the Management Council for the provisional membership process. One-half must accompany the application. The remainder of the education fee must be paid at the start of year three. In addition, provisional members must also pay the appropriate amount for annual dues each year.

"3.6.3.2.1 Exception. An institution that has been accepted for membership in a voting conference as of December 31, 2001, and meets all other specified requirements (e.g., sports sponsorship and financial aid) to be eligible for provisional membership is exempt from the one-year exploratory period and random selection process.

[3.6.3.3 unchanged.]

"3.6.3.4 Election. The annual class of provisional members shall be limited to a maximum of six schools selected in accordance with the process determined by the Membership Committee and approved by the Management Council.

Source: All Members of the Michigan Intercollegiate Athletic Association.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: In so much as a Division III voting conference may have offered conference membership to a school pending its acceptance as an NCAA provisional member, this exception will ensure that those efforts will not be hindered by the need to postpone membership due to the random selection process and exploratory period. By offering membership, the conference is ensuring that the prospective member already has explored their commitment to Division III and is in the process of making those changes necessary to comply with membership requirements.

Committee Position (Division III Membership Committee): The committee opposes this proposal. It is concerned about the equity of this proposal for independent schools, and believes the proposal may assume too much about the services conferences provide to would-be provisional members.

Action: Defeated

***NO. 46 (NO. 2-51) FINANCIAL AID - AUDIT PROCEDURES**

[Note: The sponsors have indicated their intent to withdraw the following proposal.]

Intent: To establish financial aid audit procedures and reporting requirements as specified.

Bylaws: Amend Bylaw 15 by adding new 15.5, page 121, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

"15.5 FINANCIAL AID AUDIT.

"15.5.1 Audit Procedures. Annually, an institution shall complete an audit of its financial aid disbursement practices. The audit must be conducted by an individual or entity outside the institution. The outside auditor must select 10 percent of the financial aid packages of the institution's student-athlete population and compare with financial aid packages of the non student-athlete population. The audit may include student files that were selected during the institution's Federal Financial Audit. The outside auditor shall randomly select files if additional files are needed to meet the 10 percent requirement. The audit is required to contain the following information:

- "(a)** Number of students who attended the institution during the previous academic year;
- "(b)** Number of students who received financial aid and participated in intercollegiate athletics;
- "(c)** Average amount and type of institutional financial aid provided to students who attended the institution during the previous academic year;
- "(d)** Average amount and type of institutional financial aid provided to students who attended the institution during the previous academic year and participated in intercollegiate athletics;
- "(e)** Average financial need of students who attended the institution during the previous academic year;
- "(f)** Average financial need of students who attended the institution during the previous academic year and participated in intercollegiate athletics; and
- "(g)** Percentage variation, if any, between the average amount of financial aid provided to students who attended the institution during the previous academic year and who participated in intercollegiate athletics and students who attended the institution during the previous academic year and did not participate in intercollegiate athletics.

"15.5.2 Audit Results. The audit report shall demonstrate a consistent distribution of financial aid among the student-athlete and non student-athlete population including the following:

"(a) Average amount and type of financial aid provided to students who attended the institution during the previous academic year.

"(b) Average need of students who attended the institution during the previous academic year.

"(c) The percentage of the total dollar value of institutionally administered grants awarded to student-athletes shall be comparable with to the percentage of student-athletes within the student body.

"15.5.3 Reporting. Audit results shall be reported on a form approved by the Financial Aid and Awards Committee and Management Council. The form shall be kept on file in the institution's financial aid office and available for examination upon request by an authorized representative of the NCAA. The institution shall indicate on the Institutional Self-Study Guide Notification of Completion Form whether the institution has had any non-compliance reports in the previous five years. Any variance in the information set forth in 15.5.2 shall be reported to the Financial Aid and Awards Committee for review."

Source: NCAA Division III Presidents Council [Management Council (Financial Aid and Awards Committee)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2002.

Rationale: This proposal establishes the financial aid audit process dictated by 2001 NCAA Convention Proposal Nos. 46, 46-1 and 46-2 to ensure that Division III institutions are in compliance with Division III financial aid regulations. The process requires each institution to have an outside auditor examine 10 percent of the institution's student-athlete population compared with the institution's nonstudent-athlete population. Each institution would be responsible for reporting instances of noncompliance to the NCAA Division III Financial Aid and Awards Committee for review and disposition. An institution will be required to document whether it has had any noncompliance reports during the previous five-year period on the Institutional Self-Study Guide (ISSG) Notification of Completion Form. To assist institutions in this process, the Division III Financial Aid Checklist has been incorporated into the ISSG.

Action: Withdrawn.

***NO. 47 (NO. 2-63) EXECUTIVE REGULATIONS -
SELECTION OF TEAMS AND
INDIVIDUALS FOR CHAMPIONSHIPS**

Intent: In all sports, to require that, at least 50 percent of the championship field originally designated for the respective sport shall be reserved for at-large berths, as specified.

Bylaws: Amend 31.3 by adding new 31.3.5, page 275, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

"31.3.5 Championship Field Size – Automatic Qualification and At-Large Berths. In all sports, at least 50 percent of the championship field originally designated for the respective sport shall be reserved for at-large berths. If the number of conferences that meet the automatic qualification requirements in a sport exceeds the amount equal to 50 percent of the championship field originally designated for that sport, the Championships Committee and the respective governing-sport committee shall add one berth to the championship field in that sport for every qualifying conference over the amount equal to 50 percent of the originally designated field size. The Management Council, by a three-fourths majority of its members present and voting, may waive or modify this requirement for a specific sport if it determines that the number of berths remaining after the allocation for automatic-qualifying conferences is sufficient to allow appropriate representation of other member institutions in the respective championship field."

[31.3.5 and 31.3.6 renumbered as 31.3.6 and 31.3.7, unchanged.]

Source: All members of the University Athletic Association.

Effective Date: August 1, 2007.

Rationale: Fair selection of championship fields involves two competing principles—access and competitive quality. Automatic qualification for conference champions provides equitable access for student-athletes who have demonstrated their qualifications through conference play. Similarly, provision of adequate at-large berths provides equitable opportunities for student-athletes who have demonstrated their qualifications are comparable to those of the overall pool of conference champions. If one purpose of national championships is to provide opportunities for student-athletes to measure their talents against the best of their peers, then it is important that both these interests be fairly represented in the championship fields. Without representation by conference champions, broad-based access to championships is compromised. Without adequate at-large berths, the quality of the field and the competitive experience is compromised. This proposal presents a reasonable compromise by adjusting field sizes relative to the number of automatic qualifying conferences sponsoring competition in a sport. It is based on a principle of reserving at least 50 percent of the original field for at-large berths and adding one berth for each qualifying conference that exceeds the amount equal to 50 percent of the original field size. Although the effective date of this proposal is August 1, 2007, the Championships Committee will work to implement the principles set forth in this proposal immediately.

Committee Position (Division III Championships Committee): The

committee recommends that this proposal be referred to it for consideration as part of the committee's thorough and ongoing review of the automatic qualification principles. Adoption of this proposal before the completion of this review process would be premature and unreasonably limit the scope of the committee's deliberations. The committee opposes this proposal if the recommendation to refer the proposal is defeated.

Action: Referred to Championships Committee, 228-112-2.

NO. 48 (NO. 2-40) RESOLUTION - REVIEW OF CHAMPIONSHIPS

[Division III, roll call]

"Whereas, national championships have evolved as important components of Division III; and

"Whereas, a major portion of the Division III budget is allocated for national tournament operations; and

"Whereas, principles of fairness are fundamental to the operation of NCAA tournaments; and

"Whereas, the mission statement for Division III mandates equitable competitive opportunities for student-athletes; and

"Whereas, the Division III vision statement expresses the need for a shared vision among its constituents that values fairness and equity for operating its programs; and

"Whereas, the Division III strategic plan calls for periodic review of structural issues affecting sports committees; and

"Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved, that the conduct of Division III national tournaments be examined at the conference and institutional levels and the Division III Presidents and Management Councils address principles of fair access, student welfare and management of the national tournaments, and bring to the 2003 NCAA Convention legislation that addresses discrepancies in philosophy and conduct of the tournaments, including a recommendation regarding the current ratio system for bracket allocations."

Source: All members of the College Conference of Illinois and Wisconsin and Calvin College, Greensboro College, Messiah College and Mount Union College.

Committee Position (Division III Championships Committee): The committee recommends that this proposal be referred to it for consideration as part of the committee's thorough and ongoing review of the automatic qualification principles. Adoption of this proposal before the completion of this review process would be premature and unreasonably limit the scope of the committee's deliberations. The committee opposes this proposal if the recommendation to refer the proposal is defeated.

Action: Motion to refer to the Championships Committee failed, 126-211-2. Adopted, 243-82-8.

***NO. 49 (NO. 2-61) CHAMPIONSHIPS - MINIMUM
NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS -
EXCEPTION - MEN'S VOLLEYBALL**

Intent: To specify that at least 40 institutions must sponsor the sport of men's volleyball to establish a Division III Men's Volleyball Championship.

Bylaws: Amend 18.2.4 by adding a new 18.2.4.2, page 214, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

"18.2.4 Championships Established during 1994-95 or Later. A National Collegiate Championship or a division championship may be established during the 1994-95 academic year or thereafter if at least 50 institutions sponsor the sport.

[18.2.4.1 unchanged.]

"18.2.4.2 Exception for Men's Volleyball during the 2002-03 through 2006-07 Academic Years. A Division III championship may be established during the 2002-03 through 2006-07 academic years in the sport of men's volleyball provided at least 40 institutions sponsor the sport."

[18.2.4.2 through 18.2.4.2.2 renumbered as 18.2.4.3 through 18.2.4.3.2, unchanged.]

Source: All members of the City University of New York Athletic Conference.

Effective Date: August 1, 2002.

Rationale: Currently, there are 41 Division III institutions that sponsor the sport of men's volleyball. This proposal would create an exception to the 50-school requirement set forth in Bylaw 18.2.4 for the sport of men's volleyball. This legislation also would provide additional championship opportunities for Division III student-athletes. The number of Division III institutions sponsoring men's volleyball has grown steadily over the past five years. A Division III championship would stimulate further that growth and provide additional postseason opportunities.

Committee Position (Division III Management Council): The Council opposes this proposal. The Council expressed concern with the reduction of the minimum number of institutions needed to sponsor the sport in order to establish a divisional championship.

Action: Defeated, 78-237-19.

***NO. 50 (NO. 2-62) CHAMPIONSHIPS - MEN'S
VOLLEYBALL**

Intent: To establish a Division III men's volleyball championship and a Division III Men's Volleyball Committee as specified.

A. Bylaws: Amend 18.3.4, page 215-216, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

"18.3.4 National Collegiate Division III Championships (27 28)

"Men (13 14)	Women (14)
"Baseball	Basketball
"Basketball	Cross Country
"Cross Country	Field Hockey
"Football	Ice Hockey
"Golf	Golf
"Ice Hockey	Lacrosse
"Lacrosse	Rowing
"Soccer	Soccer
"Swimming and Diving	Softball
"Tennis	Swimming and Diving
"Indoor Track and Field	Tennis
"Outdoor Track and Field	Indoor Track and Field
"Volleyball	Outdoor Track and Field
"Wrestling"	Volleyball

B. Bylaws: Amend 21.8.7 by adding new 21.8.7.22, pages 251-252, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

"21.8.7 Sports Committees with Only Championships Administration Responsibilities. To conduct Division III championships in an efficient and orderly fashion, sports committees with only championships administration responsibilities shall be established and shall report directly to the championships committee (see Bylaw 21.8.6.2).

[21.8.7.1 through 21.8.7.21, unchanged.]

"21.8.7.22 Volleyball Committee, Division III Men's. The Division III Men's Volleyball Committee shall consist of five members. One member shall be from the West region, one member from the Midwest region and three members shall be from the East region."

[21.8.7.22 renumbered as 21.8.7.23 unchanged.]

Source: All members of the City University of New York Athletic Conference.

Effective Date: Immediately, for establishment of the committee.* August 1, 2002 for the establishment of the NCAA championship.

Rationale: Currently, there are 41 Division III institutions that sponsor the sport of men's volleyball. Division III accounts for more than half of all NCAA institutions sponsoring men's volleyball, yet there never has been a Division III program selected to participate in the National Collegiate Men's Volleyball Championship. All previous partici-

pants in this championship have been Division I programs. Establishment of a Division III championship would eliminate the inequities of competing against Division I opponents for the national title. A separate Division III championship would provide an avenue for Division III programs to compete against similarly situated programs consistent with the Division III philosophy. An immediate effective date for the creation of the committee would provide the committee adequate time to gather information and prepare adequately. The championship would be established during the 2002-03 academic year; almost a year after the 2002 NCAA Convention. Institutions debating whether to start or continue a volleyball program would have time to schedule and budget with a 2002-03 championship effective date.

Committee Position (Division III Championships Committee): The committee opposes this proposal due to the August 1, 2002, effective date. The committee supports the establishment of the championship once the current 50 institution threshold is met but not sooner than the 2006-07 academic year for budget reasons.

Action: Moot with defeat of Proposal No. 49.

***NO. 51 (NO. 2-52) PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS - SCRIMMAGE**

Intent: In all sports, to permit an institution to exempt one scrimmage or date of competition (per Bylaw 17) during the preseason-practice period of the traditional segment, provided the contest or date of competition is conducted in privacy and no class time is missed.

[Note: This proposal is drafted in a nontraditional format. Appropriate editorial revisions will be made to Bylaw 17 to reflect the adoption of this proposal.]

Bylaws: Amend 17.5.3, pages 142-211, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

"17.5.3 Annual Exemptions. The maximum number of dates of competition in _____ shall exclude the following

[17.5.3-(a) through 17.5.3-(d) unchanged.]

"(e) Scrimmage. One date of competition/contest conducted during the preseason-practice period of the traditional segment provided the date/contest is conducted in privacy and no class time is missed.

[Remainder of 17.5.3 unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Division III Presidents Council [Management Council (Interpretations and Legislation Committee)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2002.

Rationale: Current legislation in Bylaw 17 presents many inequities among sports relating to the number of scrimmage opportunities. For example, the sport of basketball has two scrim-

mage opportunities, the sport of baseball has none and the sport of soccer has the potential to play in up to three scrimmages. This proposal is designed to permit each sport to conduct one exempted scrimmage contest or date of competition (per Bylaw 17) conducted during the preseason-practice period of the traditional segment. This scrimmage opportunity must be conducted in privacy and no class time may be missed. These additional conditions are intended to ensure that this opportunity does not evolve into another regular contest. This proposal will provide scrimmage opportunities to 19 sports while only two sports (basketball and soccer) will lose current scrimmage opportunities. This issue originated with the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee, and it should be noted that the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee supports this proposal.

Action: Defeated, 151-182-6.

***NO. 52 (NO. 2-54) PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS -
BASKETBALL - PRESEASON
PRACTICE ACTIVITY**

Intent: To permit two student-athletes who have not participated in basketball at the certifying institution to participate in voluntary skill development with one coach for not more than two hours per week during the four weeks immediately prior to the first permissible basketball practice. Further, to specify that not more than two student-athletes and one coach may be present during this activity at any one time.

- A. Bylaws:** Amend 17.1.1.1 by adding new 17.1.1.1.1, page 138, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

"17.1.1.1.1 Exception - Basketball Skill Development. It is permissible for student-athletes who have not previously participated in the sport of basketball at the certifying institution to engage in voluntary skill development with one coaching staff member for a maximum of two hours per week during the four weeks immediately prior to the first permissible practice opportunity provided not more than two student-athletes and one coach are present during this activity at any one time."

- B. Bylaws:** Amend 17.5.2.1 by adding new 17.5.2.1.2.3, page 149, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

"17.5.2.1.2.3 Exception - Basketball Skill Development. It is permissible for student-athletes who previously have not participated in the sport of basketball at the certifying institution to engage in voluntary skill development with one coaching staff member for a maximum of two hours per week during the four weeks immediately prior to the first permissible practice opportunity provided not

more than two student-athletes and one coach are present during this activity at any one time."

C. Bylaws: Amend 17.5.6, page 150, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

"17.5.6 Out-of-Season Athletically Related Activities. Student-athletes and members of the coaching staff shall not engage in athletically related activities outside the institution's playing season per Bylaw 17.02.1.1. except for the following activities:

"(a) *However, participation by Wheelchair Basketball.* Members of an institution's basketball squad in a wheelchair basketball game against an established wheelchair team after the close of the institution's regular basketball season is permissible, provided the squad members do not wear regular basketball uniforms, and there is no regular practice before the game.; and

"(b) **Skill Development.** It is permissible for student-athletes who previously have not participated in the sport of basketball at the certifying institution to engage in voluntary skill development with one coaching staff member for a maximum of two hours per week during the four weeks immediately prior to the first permissible practice opportunity provided not more than two student-athletes and one coach are present during this activity at any one time."

Source: All members of the Massachusetts State College Athletic Conference.

Effective Date: August 1, 2002.

Rationale: Most basketball players are in need of significant skill development. Current legislation prohibits coaches from providing such development until October 15. By permitting coaches to teach a maximum of eight hours over a four-week preseason time period, student-athletes who have not previously participated in the sport of basketball at the certifying institution will receive valuable instruction and, more importantly, be able to establish an earlier relationship with coaches who will help the student-athlete's adjustment to his or her new environment. Student-athletes should be allowed to be exposed to their coaches' knowledge much like what is available to them from most other departments on campus. Currently, Divisions I and II permit out of season voluntary skill instruction, and most Division III players have such a need. Finally, the maximum of eight hours of preseason skill development is much less overall time than currently is used by most other Division III sports in the respective nontraditional seasons.

Committee Position (Division III Management Council Playing and Practice Seasons Subcommittee): The committee opposes this proposal. It notes the increased time demands on student-athletes, the inconsistent treatment of student-athletes within the sport and concern that the permissible workouts will be more than "voluntary."

Action: Not moved.

***NO. 53 (NO. 2-57) THREE-DAY NONCONTACT,
CONDITIONING PRACTICE PERIOD -
FOOTBALL**

Intent: In the sport of football, to permit the use of shoulder pads during the three-day, noncontact, conditioning practice period.

Bylaws: Amend 17.10.2.2, page 162, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

"17.10.2.2 Three-Day, Noncontact, Conditioning Practice Period. Physical activity during the first three days of the preseason practice period shall be limited to noncontact, conditioning drills. No football gear or protective equipment other than head-gear, **shoulder pads**, shoes, pants and porous, lightweight jerseys shall be worn by players during practice sessions in this three-day period."

Source: All members of the Middle Atlantic Conference.

Effective Date: August 1, 2002.

Rationale: The first three days of preseason practice are crucial in getting players prepared for the upcoming season. Most players follow conditioning programs during the summer so that they can return for preseason practice in good physical condition. Regardless of physical condition, heat acclimation is a crucial factor in the preparation of football players in the preseason. Allowing the use of shoulder pads during those first three days will allow the body to make a safer adjustment to the heat and humidity present in late August. Although this is a noncontact period, incidental contact does occur, particularly, with the ground. The use of shoulder pads will help provide protection from this type of contact. By wearing shoulder pads, players also are able to better develop their skills under more realistic conditions.

Committee Position (Division III Management Council Playing and Practice Seasons Subcommittee): The subcommittee opposes this proposal based on health and safety concerns expressed by the NCAA Committee on Competitive Safeguards and Medical Aspects of Sports.

Action: Withdrawn.

***NO. 54 (NO. 2-58) PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS -
FOOTBALL - NONTRADITIONAL
SEGMENT**

Intent: In the sport of football, to permit strength and conditioning training sessions during the nontraditional segment, as specified.

Bylaws: Amend 17.10.6, page 163, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

"17.10.6 Out-of-Season Athletically Related Activities. Student-athletes and members of the coaching staff shall not engage in athletically related activities outside the playing season per Bylaw 17.02.1.1 except that an institution is permitted to conduct conditioning and strength training sessions for a period of five consecutive weeks during the nontraditional segment. No missed class time is permitted for these sessions. The use of footballs, helmets, pads, blocking sleds, or any other form of sport-related equipment is prohibited."

Source: All members of the New Jersey Athletic Conference.

Effective Date: August 1, 2002.

Rationale: While a majority of other sports are permitted to have nontraditional seasons, football is denied this opportunity. This proposal addresses two main concerns of administrators and football coaches by permitting coaching staffs to supervise properly the off-season conditioning of their student-athletes. First, the physical nature of the sport demands a high level of fitness and proper conditioning in preparation for the season. By affording them this opportunity, coaches would ensure proper training and supervision to protect the health and safety of those student-athletes in the long term. Second, the Division III philosophy states that we are to "assure that athletics participants are not treated differently from other members of the student body," yet student-athletes are treated differently from sport-to-sport. Football is permitted 21 weeks, like all other sports, but in reality uses 13 or 14 weeks. Other sports have the opportunity to use all 21 weeks and compete during the nontraditional segment. Football competes in the fewest number of contests than any other team sport and misses the least amount of class time. By granting football student-athletes a supervised off-season conditioning and strength training opportunity, Division III will be a step closer to affording them opportunities similarly allowed other student-athletes.

Committee Position (Division III Management Council Playing and Practice Seasons Subcommittee): The subcommittee opposes this proposal. The subcommittee noted that the proposal impacts multisport student-athletes, increases use of institutional facilities and has implications on institutional staff members.

Action: Defeated, 133-155-46 on first vote. Motion to reconsider: Approved, 158-118-47. Adopted on reconsideration, 149-116-54.

***NO. 54-1. PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS -
FOOTBALL - NONTRADITIONAL
SEGMENT**

Intent: To limit conditioning and strength training sessions to four days per student-athlete per week and to prohibit such activities from being conducted on the weekend.

Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 54, 17.10.6, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

"17.10.6 Out-of-Season Athletically Related Activities. Student-athletes and members of the coaching staff shall not engage in athletically related activities outside the playing season per Bylaw 17.02.1.1 except an institution is permitted to conduct conditioning and strength training sessions for a period of five consecutive weeks during the nontraditional segment. **Such sessions are limited to four days per student-athlete per week and may not take place on the weekends (i.e., Saturday or Sunday).** No missed class time is permitted for these sessions. The use of footballs, helmets, pads, blocking sleds, or any other form of sport-related equipment is prohibited."

Source: All members of the New Jersey Athletic Conference.

Effective Date: August 1, 2002.

Rationale: These limits to the conditioning and strength training period are designed to accommodate the concerns heard from the general membership. Placing reasonable parameters on the time spent in conditioning and strength training sessions will serve to promote student-athlete welfare and contain the potential strain on staff and facilities.

Committee Position (Division III Management Council): The Council opposes this proposal. The Council noted that prohibiting conditioning and strength sessions from occurring on the weekend may impact academic work during the week.

Action: Defeated, 105-181-44.

***NO. 55 (NO. 2-59) PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS -
NONTRADITIONAL SEGMENT
LACROSSE**

Intent: In the sport of lacrosse to specify that an institution may not participate in more than four contests during the nontraditional segment.

[Note: This proposal has been modified to indicate that the sport of lacrosse is limited to 17 dates of competition consistent with the action taken by the Division III Administrative Committee on 8/29/01.]

Bylaws: Amend 17.14.5, page 173, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

"17.14.5 Number and Dates of Competition.

"17.14.5.1 Maximum Limitations - Institutional. A member institution shall limit its total playing schedule with outside competition in the sport of lacrosse during the institution's lacrosse playing season to a maximum of 17 dates of competition in men's lacrosse and women's lacrosse, with not

more than four dates of competition during the nontraditional segment, except for those dates of competition excluded under Bylaws 17.14.5.3, 17.14.5.4 and 17.14.5.5.

[17.14.5.1.1 unchanged.]

"17.14.5.2 Maximum Limitations—Student-Athlete. An individual student-athlete may participate in each academic year in a maximum of 17 lacrosse dates of competition, with not more than four dates of competition during the nontraditional segment. This limitation includes those contests in which the student-athlete represents the institution including competition as a member of the varsity, junior varsity or freshman team of the institution in accordance with Bylaws 17.02.4 and 17.02.8."

[Remainder of 17.14.5 unchanged]

Source: All members of the New Jersey Athletic Conference.

Effective Date: August 1, 2002.

Rationale: When the New Jersey Athletic Conference presented its proposed amendments to the nontraditional segment at the 2001 NCAA Convention, the sport of lacrosse was listed in the intent statement but inadvertently omitted from the legislative part of the proposal specific to dates of competition limitations during the nontraditional segment. The rationale for this proposal is no different from the rationale presented with Proposal No. 50 from last year related to the sports of field hockey, soccer, baseball, volleyball and soccer. The New Jersey Athletic Conference believes that, while the traditional segment should be the primary time to focus on practice and competition, allowing both practice and competition during the nontraditional segment also offers many benefits to student-athletes. These benefits are consistent with the Division III philosophy statement. This proposal strives to balance the concerns of the Presidents Council with respect for the wishes of Division III student-athletes.

Committee Position (Division III Management Council Playing and Practice Seasons Subcommittee): The subcommittee supports this proposal.

Action: Adopted, 276-9-38.

GENERAL

NO. 56 (NO. 2-42) SENIOR WOMAN ADMINISTRATOR -- APPOINTMENT

Intent: To specify that an institution that has a female director of athletics may appoint a different female who reports to the director of athletics as the senior woman administrator.

Constitution: Amend 4.02.4 by adding new 4.02.4.1, page 22, as follows:

[Division III]

"4.02.4.1 Female Athletics Director. An institution with a female director of athletics may appoint a different female who reports to the director of athletics as the senior woman administrator."

Source: NCAA Division III Presidents Council [Management Council (Interpretations and Legislation Committee)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2002.

Rationale: Currently in Division III, 95 females serve as director of athletics or women's director of athletics. Under the current definition of a "senior woman administrator" (SWA), those 95 individuals may also serve as the SWA. This change will increase the number of women involved at a senior level in the administration of intercollegiate athletics. This change also is consistent with the intent of the original SWA legislation. For NCAA mailing purposes, the appointed individual will receive all mailings as the SWA.

Action: Adopted by paddle vote.

NO. 57 (NO. 2-45) DEFINITION OF STUDENT-ATHLETE

Intent: To specify that an individual becomes a student-athlete once he or she participates on an intercollegiate team under the jurisdiction of the athletics department. Further, to specify that an individual is no longer a student-athlete if he or she chooses not to participate the following playing season, withdraws or is dismissed from the certifying institution or after all intercollegiate eligibility has been exhausted, whichever occurs first.

A. Bylaws: Amend 12.02.5, page 55, as follows:

[Division III]

"12.02.5 Student-Athlete. A student-athlete is a student whose enrollment was solicited by a member of the athletics staff or other representative of athletics interests with a view toward the student's ultimate participation in the intercollegiate athletics program. Any other student individual becomes a student-athlete only when the student reports for individual participation on an intercollegiate squad team that is under the jurisdiction of the athletics department, as specified in Constitution 3.2.4.4. A student is not deemed a student-athlete solely on the basis of prior high-school athletics participation. An individual remains a student-athlete until he or she does not participate in the team's next immediate playing season, withdraws or is dismissed from the certifying institution or until all intercollegiate eligibility has been exhausted, whichever occurs first."

B. Bylaws: Amend 13.02.2, page 70, as follows:

[Division III]

"13.02.2 Student-Athlete. An individual becomes a student-athlete **only** when either of the following conditions are satisfied:

"(a) The individual's enrollment was enlisted by a member of the athletic staff or other representative of the institution's athletics interests that are viewed towards the student's ultimate participation in the intercollegiate athletics program and the student-athlete attends the first day of class while enrolled in at least a minimum full-time program of studies or;

"(b) The individual participates in on an intercollegiate squad team practice or contest that is under the jurisdiction of the athletics department. An individual remains a student-athlete until he or she does not participate in the team's next immediate playing season, withdraws or is dismissed from the certifying institution or until all intercollegiate eligibility has been exhausted, whichever occurs first."

Source: All members of the Northwest Conference.

Effective Date: August 1, 2002.

Rationale: Under the current legislation, an individual becomes a student-athlete when he or she reports for practice under the jurisdiction of the athletics department or was recruited by the certifying institution and attends the first day of classes. In addition, once an individual becomes a student-athlete, that status is retained indefinitely. The Northwest Conference believes that an individual should become a student-athlete only when he or she participates for an intercollegiate team under the jurisdiction of the athletics department. Such status should not be tied to recruitment, as is currently the case. Further, status as a student-athlete should not be retained if the individual chooses not to participate in team's next immediate playing season, withdraws or is dismissed from the institution or after all intercollegiate eligibility has been exhausted, whichever occurs first. For example, if an individual participates in football during his first year of enrollment, he becomes a student-athlete but loses that status if he chooses not to participate in football in year two (the following year) or withdraws or is dismissed from the institution or when his intercollegiate eligibility has been exhausted.

Committee Position (Division III Interpretations and Legislation Committee): The committee opposes this proposal. The proposal appears to cause more confusion than benefit and will make the administrative process more difficult than the current standard.

Action: Defeated by paddle vote.

**NO. 58 (NO. 2-43) ATHLETICS PERSONNEL -
EMPLOYMENT WITH PROFESSIONAL
SPORTS ORGANIZATIONS**

Intent: To eliminate the legislative prohibition regarding employment or

income arrangements between institutional athletics department staff members and professional sports organizations.

Bylaws: Amend 11.3.2, page 52, as follows:

[Division III]

"11.3.2 Employment with Professional Sports Organizations

"11.3.2.1 Nonpermissible Employment Arrangements. Staff members of a member institution's athletics department shall not accept compensation or gratuities for representing a professional sports organization as a coach or scout, in the negotiating of a contract, or for the performance of other services that involve the observation of or contact with athletics talent. Except as provided in Bylaw 11.3.3.2, any compensational arrangement between a professional sports organization and a college staff member (e.g., for scouting other professional teams or assisting the professional employer in coaching its team) is evidence of an indirect arrangement to assure the staff member's assistance in evaluating or procuring college talent.

"11.3.2.1.1 Employment during Periods When Not under Contract with Member Institution. A staff member may not be compensated by a professional sports organization for services rendered during a period in which the staff member is not actually under contract to the institution or is absent from campus (e.g., temporary leave of absence, paid or unpaid). This provision applies to individuals employed by the member institution on a regular and continuing basis, even though the contract may be for a period of less than a full year.

"11.3.2.1.2 Semiprofessional Organization. Employment arrangements with semiprofessional sports organizations or with professional or semiprofessional organizations involved in a sport in which the NCAA conducts a championship (or one in which the playing rules and skills are directly related to the NCAA sport; e.g., box lacrosse, indoor soccer or indoor football) are subject to the limitations in this section.

"11.3.2.2 Permissible Employment or Income Arrangements

"11.3.2.2.1 Employment Unrelated to Restricted Activities. A staff member may be employed by a professional sports organization if the institution documents that the individual is in no way directly or indirectly involved in the coaching, scouting or contacting of athletics talent or the negotiation of a contract for such talent (e.g., participation as a player on a professional team).

"11.3.2.2.4 Established Professional Enhancement Program. A staff member may participate in an established, formal program administered by a professional sports organization and designed to enhance the skills associated with the staff member's profession. A staff

member participating in the program may receive direct compensation (including stipends) and expenses from the sponsoring organization, consistent with the compensation and expenses received by other program participants. The Management Council shall establish necessary policies and guidelines regarding participation by an institution's staff members in such a program."

Source: NCAA Division III Presidents Council [Management Council (Interpretations and Legislation Committee)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2002.

Rationale: In the spirit of deregulation, each institution should have the autonomy to establish its own policies regarding the employment and income arrangements between its athletics department staff members and professional sports organizations. In many sports, institutional coaches currently volunteer their time and services to assist in coaching activities with professional teams that are located in the locale of the institution. Each institution is in the best position to determine whether such activities are appropriate and can be conducted without negatively impacting the commitment to the institution's team and student-athletes. Further, the requirements related to the reporting of any outside income to the chief executive officer should ensure that appropriate institutional control is maintained as it relates to an athletics staff member's involvement in such activities.

Action: Adopted by paddle vote.

NO. 59 (NO. 2-49) ELIGIBILITY - NONTRADITIONAL COURSES

Intent: To permit a student-athlete to use hours earned in nontraditional courses in conjunction with hours taken in residence to meet the full-time enrollment requirement. Further, to permit hours earned in nontraditional courses to be used to meet satisfactory-progress requirements.

A. Bylaws: Amend 14.1.7.2.5, page 94, as follows:

[Division III]

"14.1.7.2.5 Extension Nontraditional Courses. A student-athlete may use a combination of hours taken in residence during a regular term and *extension courses taken from the certifying institution taught via the Internet, distance learning, independent study, individualized instruction, correspondence and courses taught by similar means taken during that term* to meet the minimum 12-hour enrollment requirement, provided: *the institution considers enrollment in such extension courses as regular course enrollment for all students during term time.*

"(a) The institution considers enrollment in such courses as regular course enrollment for all students during term time;

"(b) The college, university or agency offering or sponsoring the course(s) is accredited by a regional accrediting agency; and

"(c) The course(s) is accepted by the certifying institution."

B. Bylaws: Amend 14.4.1.2.2, page 98, as follows:

[Division III]

"14.4.1.2.2 Correspondence and Extension Nontraditional Courses from Another Institution. Correspondence, extension and credit-by-examination courses taken taught via the Internet, distance learning, independent study, individualized instruction, correspondence and courses taught in similar means taken from an institution other than the one in which a student-athlete is enrolled as a full-time student shall not be used in determining a student's academic standing or satisfactory progress, provided:

"(a) The institution considers enrollment in such courses as regular course enrollment for all students during term time.

"(b) The college, university or agency offering or sponsoring the course(s) is accredited by a regional accrediting agency; and

"(c) The course(s) is accepted by the certifying institution.

"14.4.1.2.2.1 Waivers. Waivers of this restriction may be granted by the Management Council in response to written requests from member institutions.

"14.4.1.2.2.2 Centralized Correspondence-Course Exception. In a state that centralizes the offering of correspondence courses through one state institution, a student enrolled in another of the state's institutions may use a correspondence course from the institution authorized to offer such courses in determining the student's academic standing or satisfactory progress."

Source: NCAA Division III Presidents Council (Management Council (Interpretations and Legislation Committee)).

Effective Date: August 1, 2002.

Rationale: Current legislation does not permit a student-athlete to use hours taken via extension courses taken at an institution other than the certifying institution. This proposal will permit the use of those hours to meet full-time enrollment or satisfactory-progress requirements provided the specified conditions are met. Institutions will have the "academic freedom" to accept hours taken via a nontraditional format. Due to modern technology, courses delivered in a nontraditional format are becoming more common.

Action: Defeated by paddle vote.

NO. 60 (NO. 2-53) **PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS -
DEFINITIONS**

[Note: The sponsors have indicated their intent to withdraw the following proposal.]

Intent: To clarify that an institution is charged with a contest or date of competition if the institution's team competes against an outside team as opposed to competing against another institution's team.

A. Bylaws: Amend 17.02.2, page 136, as follows:

[Division III]

"17.02.2 Contest. A contest is any game, match, exhibition, scrimmage or joint practice session with *another institution's an outside team*, regardless of its formality, in which competition in a sport occurs between an intercollegiate athletics team or individual representing a member institution and any *other outside team or individual not representing the intercollegiate athletics program of the same member institution.*"

B. Bylaws: Amend 17.02.5, page 136, as follows:

[Division III]

"17.02.5 Date of Competition. A date of competition is a single date on which any contest(s), with *another institution's an outside team or individual* takes place. (See Bylaw 17.02.2.)"

C. Bylaws: Amend 17.02.9, page 137, as follows:

[Division III]

"17.02.9 Outside Competition. Outside competition is athletics competition against any *other athletics outside team* (including an alumni team) *or individual that does not represent the intercollegiate athletics program of the same institution.*"

Source: All members of the Northwest Conference.

Effective Date: August 1, 2002.

Rationale: Under the current legislation, an institution may participate against an outside team and not be charged with a contest or date of competition inasmuch as the definitions of contest and date of competition only refer to "another institution's team." However, that's not the correct application of the legislation. This proposal will clarify that any competition by an institution's team against an outside team, including another institution's team, would count as a contest or date of competition. This proposal is intended to clarify the confusing definitions related to contests, dates of competition and outside teams.

Committee Position (Division III Management Council): The Management Council has adopted noncontroversial legislation, as recommended by the Division III Interpretations and Legislation Committee, to achieve the same goal as the proposal.

Action: Withdrawn.

**NO. 61 (NO. 2-55) PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS -
FOREIGN TOURS**

Intent: In the sports of archery, badminton, bowling, fencing, gymnastics, rifle, women's rowing, skiing, squash, synchronized swimming, team handball, men's volleyball and water polo, to specify that foreign tours may not occur more than once every three years.

A. Bylaws: Amend 17.2.5.4, page 143, as follows:

[Division III]

"17.2.5.4 Once-in-Four Three-Years Exemption-Foreign Tour. The dates of competition on a foreign tour, provided the tour occurs only once in a *four three-year* period and is conducted by the member institution in accordance with the procedures set forth in Bylaw 30.7 (see Bylaw 17.30)."

B. Bylaws: Amend 17.3.5.4, page 145, as follows:

[Division III]

"17.3.5.4 Once-in-Four Three-Years Exemption-Foreign Tour. The dates of competition on a foreign tour, provided the tour occurs only once in a *four three-year* period and is conducted by the member institution in accordance with the procedures set forth in Bylaw 30.7 (see Bylaw 17.30)."

C. Bylaws: Amend 17.6.5.4, page 153, as follows:

[Division III]

"17.6.5.4 Foreign Tour. The dates of competition on a foreign tour, provided the tour occurs only once in a *four three-year* period and is conducted by the member institution in accordance with the procedures set forth in Bylaw 30.7 (see Bylaw 17.30)."

D. Bylaws: Amend 17.8.5.5, page 158, as follows:

[Division III]

"17.8.5.5 Once-in-Four Three-Years Exemptions-Foreign Tour. The contests played on a foreign tour, provided the tour is conducted by the member institution in accordance with the procedures set forth in Bylaw 30.7 (also see Bylaw 17.30). An institution may not use this exemption in the same year that it uses an exemption set forth in Bylaw 17.8.5.4."

E. Bylaws: Amend 17.12.5.5, page 158, as follows:

[Division III]

"17.12.5.5 Once-in-Four Three-Years Exemptions-Foreign Tour. The contests played on a foreign tour, provided the tour is conducted by the member institution in accordance with the procedures set forth in Bylaw 30.7 (also see Bylaw 17.30). An institution may not use this exemption in the same year that it uses an exemption set forth in Bylaw 17.12.5.3."

F. Bylaws: Amend 17.15.5.5, page 176, as follows:

[Division III]

"17.15.5.5 *Once-in-Four Three-Years Exemptions-Foreign Tour.* The contests played on a foreign tour, provided the tour is conducted by the member institution in accordance with the procedures set forth in Bylaw 30.7 (also see Bylaw 17.30). An institution may not use this exemption in the same year that it uses an exemption set forth in Bylaw 17.15.5.4."

G. Bylaws: Amend 17.16.5.4, page 178, as follows:

[Division III]

"17.16.5.4 *Foreign Tour.* The dates of competition in rowing on a foreign tour, provided the tour occurs only once in a *four three-year* period and is conducted by the member institution in accordance with the procedures set forth in Bylaw 30.7 (see Bylaw 17.30)."

H. Bylaws: Amend 17.17.5.5, page 180, as follows:

[Division III]

"17.17.5.5 *Once-in-Four Three-Years Exemptions-Foreign Tour.* The contests played on a foreign tour, provided the tour is conducted by the member institution in accordance with the procedures set forth in Bylaw 30.7 (also see Bylaw 17.30). An institution may not use this exemption in the same year that it uses an exemption set forth in Bylaw 17.17.5.4."

I. Bylaws: Amend 17.20.5.4, page 188, as follows:

[Division III]

"17.20.5.4 *Once-In-Four Three-Years Exemption-Foreign Tour.* The dates of competition on a foreign tour, provided the tour occurs only once in a *four three-year* period and is conducted by the member institution in accordance with the procedures set forth in Bylaw 30.7 (see Bylaw 17.30)."

J. Bylaws: Amend 17.22.5.4, page 193, as follows:

[Division III]

"17.22.5.4 *Once-in-Four Three-Years Exemption-Foreign Tour.* The dates of competition on a foreign tour, provided the tour occurs only once in a *four three-year* period and is conducted by the member institution in accordance with the procedures set forth in Bylaw 30.7 (see Bylaw 17.30)."

K. Bylaws: Amend 17.23.5.4, page 195, as follows:

[Division III]

"17.23.5.4 *Once-in-Four Three-Years Exemption-Foreign Tour.* The dates of competition on a foreign tour, provided the tour occurs only once in a *four three-year* period and is conducted by the member institution in accordance with the procedures set forth in Bylaw 30.7 (see Bylaw 17.30)."

L. Bylaws: Amend 17.26.12, page 203, as follows:

[Division III]

"17.26.12 *Once-in-Four Three-Years Exemption-Foreign Tour.*

Men. The dates of competition in volleyball on a foreign tour, provided the tour occurs only once in a *four* three-year period and is conducted by the member institution in accordance with the procedures set forth in Bylaw 30.7 (also see Bylaw 17.30)."

M. Bylaws: Amend 17.27.8.5, page 207, as follows:

[Division III]

"17.27.8.5 *Once-in-Four Three-Years Exemption-Men and Women-Foreign Tour.* The contests played on a foreign tour, provided the tour is conducted by the member institution in accordance with the procedures set forth in Bylaw 30.7 (also see Bylaw 17.30). In the sport of men's water polo, an institution may not use this exemption in the same year that it uses an exemption set forth in Bylaw 17.27.6.3."

Source: NCAA Division III Presidents Council [Management Council (Interpretations and Legislation Committee)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2002.

Rationale: Currently, sports that conclude with a National Collegiate Championship or a National Governing Body Championship are limited to one foreign tour every four years. All sports that conclude with an NCAA Division III championship are permitted to engage in a foreign tour once every three years. This proposal will standardize all Division III sports by limiting foreign-tour participation to not more than once every three years.

Action: Adopted by paddle vote.

NO. 62 (NO. 2-56)

**PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS -
FIRST PERMISSIBLE CONTEST AND
PRACTICE DATE - FOOTBALL**

Intent: To permit an institution to play its first football contest on the Thursday prior to Labor Day. Further, to specify that an institution electing to play its first football contest on the Thursday prior to Labor Day may not begin permissible practice activities prior to the date that provides 27 practice opportunities from the Friday prior to Labor Day.

A. Bylaws: Amend 17.10.2.1, page 162, as follows:

[Division III]

"17.10.2.1 *First Practice Date.* A member institution shall not commence official preseason football practice sessions, for the varsity, junior varsity or freshman team, before the date that will permit a maximum of 27 practice opportunities before its first scheduled intercollegiate game or the Friday before Labor Day if the institution elects to play its first game the Thursday prior to Labor Day (see Bylaw 17.02.11)."

B. Bylaws: Amend 17.10.3, page 162, as follows:

[Division III]

"17.10.3 First Contest. A member institution shall not play its first contest (game) with outside competition in football before the Thursday preceding Labor Day except when selected to participate in the National Football Foundation benefit game or the American Football Coaches Retirement Trust benefit game; both sponsored by the National Association of Collegiate Directors of Athletics, and played in the week prior to the beginning of the regular playing season in football. *A member institution shall not play its first contest (game) with outside competition in football before the Friday or Saturday 11 weeks before the first round of the Division III Football Championship.*"

Source: All members of the Wisconsin Intercollegiate Athletic Conference.

Effective Date: August 1, 2002.

Rationale: Football scheduling is becoming increasingly difficult for institutions in certain regions of the country, and many of those institutions are forced to travel considerable distances and/or play Division II or non-NCAA opponents in order to fill their schedules. Allowing institutions to play their first game on the Thursday prior to Labor Day would provide greater flexibility in scheduling, which often results in lower costs and less missed class time for student-athletes. Since a number of institutions do not begin classes for the fall term until after Labor Day, playing a game on the preceding Thursday would not result in any missed class time for those institutions. Furthermore, for those institutions that find it necessary to schedule Division II opponents, this modification would make the first permissible date for Division III consistent with that of Division II. It also is important to note that this is permissive legislation enabling an institution to elect to play its first game on a date that results in the least amount of missed class time for its student-athletes. The change to the first permissible practice date would eliminate concerns relative to increased costs or a competitive advantage gained by lengthening the football season by one day as a result of an institution electing to play its first game on the Thursday prior to Labor Day.

Committee Position (Division III Management Council Playing and Practice Seasons Subcommittee): The subcommittee took no position on this proposal.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 63 (NO. 2-60)

**CONTEST EXEMPTIONS - MEN'S
VOLLEYBALL - MOLTEN
CHAMPIONSHIP**

Intent: In the sport of men's volleyball, to exempt participation, on an annual basis, in the Molten Volleyball Championship.

Bylaws: Amend 17.26.10, pages 203, as follows:

[Division III]

"17.26.10 Annual Exemptions. The maximum number of dates

of competition in the sport of volleyball shall exclude the following (see Figure 17-28):

[17.26.10-(a) and 17.26.10-(b) unchanged.]

"(c) **Season-Ending Tournament.** Competition in one season-ending volleyball tournament (i.e., **Molten Championship**, NCAA championship, NAIA championship, National Invitational Volleyball Championship and NCCAA championship). A season-ending tournament involves competition after the end of the regular season between teams that are not identified until the close of that regular season;"

[Remainder 17.26.10 unchanged.]

Source: All members of the City University of New York Athletic Conference.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: Currently, the NCAA sponsors a National Collegiate Championship in the sport of men's volleyball. No Division III institution ever has been selected to participate in this championship. The Molten Championship was established to create championship opportunities for Division III men's volleyball programs. This is a season ending tournament crowning a national champion. Permitting institutions to exempt this event from its maximum number of contests would allow this tournament to be treated similar to other season-ending tournaments (e.g., NCAA, NAIA, NCCAA). The immediate effective date will allow qualifying teams for this years tournament to exempt such contests and be able to schedule additional contests between their conference championship and the Molten Championship. Due to scheduling conflicts, the dates for the upcoming Molten Championship were selected after Division III institutions' schedules were completed leaving a gap of three to four weeks of inactivity.

Committee Position (Division III Management Council): The Council took no position on this proposal.

Action: Adopted by paddle vote.

DIII 2002 Roll Call Vote

	Prop. # 40	Prop. # 41	Prop. # 42	Prop. # 43	Prop. # 44	Motion to divide #45	Prop. # 45-1	Prop. # 45	Motion to refer Prop #47	Motion to refer #48	Prop. # 48	Prop. # 49	Prop. # 51	Prop. # 54-1	Prop. # 54	Prop. # 55	Motion to Recon. #54	Prop. # 54 re-vote
Adrian College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	
Agnes Scott College	A	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	A	Y	A	A	
Albertus Magnus College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	A	Y	N	N	Y	N	A	A	Y	A	A	
Albion College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	
Albright College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Alfred University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	
Allegheny College		N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	
Alma College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	
Alvernia College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	A	A	Y	A	A	
Amherst College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	A	N	N	N	N	Y	N	
Anderson University (Indiana)	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	A	Y	
Anna Maria College																		
Arcadia University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	A	N	N	N	A	N	N	
Augsburg College	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Augustana College (Illinois)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Aurora University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Austin College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Averett University																		
Babson College	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	A	N	
Baldwin-Wallace College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N				
Bard College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	
Bates College	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	A	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	
Beloit College	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N				
Benedictine University (Illinois)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Bennett College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	A	Y	N	Y	Y			Y			
Bernard M. Baruch College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	A	
Bethany College (West Virginia)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N		N	
Bethel College (Minnesota)	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N		Y	N	
Blackburn College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	
Bluffton College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	
Bowdoin College	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	
Brandels University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	A	A	Y	A	A	
Bridgewater College (Virginia)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Bridgewater State College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	
State University College at Brockport	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	A	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Brooklyn College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Bryn Mawr College	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y			Y			
Buena Vista University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Buffalo State College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Cabrini College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	A	A	Y	
California Institute of Technology	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	A	A	Y	
California Lutheran University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	
California State University, Hayward	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	A	A	A		Y	
University of California, Santa Cruz	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	
Calvin College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	
Capital University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	N	
Carleton College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	
Carnegie Mellon University	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	
Carroll College (Wisconsin)																		
Carthage College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Case Western Reserve University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	
Castleton State College	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Catholic University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	
Cazenovia College																		
Cedar Crest College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	A	A	Y	N	
Centenary College (New Jersey)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	A		
Central College (Iowa)	N	N	N	N	N	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	A		
Centre College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	
Chapman University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y		
Chatham College																		
Chestnut Hill College																		
University of Chicago	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	A	N	
Chowan College																		
Christopher Newport University																		
City College of New York	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	
Claremont McKenna-Harvey Mudd-Scripps Colleges	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	
Clark University (Massachusetts)	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	
Clarke College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N				Y	A	
Clarkson University	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	A	A	A	Y	A	

	Prop. # 40	Prop. # 41	Prop. # 42	Prop. # 43	Prop. # 44	Motion to divide #45	Prop. # 45-1	Prop. # 45	Motion to refer Prop. #47	Motion to refer #48	Prop. # 48	Prop. # 49	Prop. # 51	Prop. # 54-1	Prop. # 54	Prop. # 55	Motion to Recon. #54	Prop. # 54 re-vote
Coe College	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	
Colby College	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	
Colby-Sawyer College	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	N	
Colorado College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Concordia College, Moorhead	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	H	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Concordia University (Illinois)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Concordia University at Austin	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Concordia University (Wisconsin)	A	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	N	Y	A	Y	Y		Y	Y	
Connecticut College	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	A	A	
Cornell College	N	N	N	N	N		Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	
State University College at Cortland	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Curry College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
University of Dallas	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	A	N	N	N	
Daniel Webster College																		
Defiance College	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	
Delaware Valley College																		
Denison University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
DePauw University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	A	A	
DeSales University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Dickinson College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Drew University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	A	A	Y	A	A	
University of Dubuque	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	N	
Earlham College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	
East Texas Baptist University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	
Eastern College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	A	Y	Y	Y	
Eastern Connecticut State University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	A	Y	Y	Y	
Eastern Mennonite University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y		Y	N	Y	N	N	
Eastern Nazarene College																		
Eastern Oregon University	Y	Y	Y	Y														
Edgewood College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y			
Elizabethtown College																		
Elmhurst College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Elmira College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	
Elms College																		
Emerson College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y		
Emmanuel College (Massachusetts)																		
Emory and Henry College																		
Emory University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	A	N	Y	N	A
Endicott College	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Eureka College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	
Fairleigh Dickinson University, Madison	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	A	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	
Ferrum College	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Fisk University																		
Fitchburg State College																		
Fontbonne College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Framingham State College			Y															
Franklin & Marshall College	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	
Franklin College	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	A	N	Y	A	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N
State University College at Fredonia	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	A	Y	A	A
Frostburg State University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N		Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Gallaudet University																		
State University College at Geneseo	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	A	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	
George Fox University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	A	A	A	A	
Gettysburg College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Gordon College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	
Goucher College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	
Greensboro College			Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	
Greenville College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Grinnell College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	
Grove City College	N	N	N	N	Y		A	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	
Guilford College			Y															
Gustavus Adolphus College																		
Gwynedd-Mercy College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	A	A	Y	A	A
Hamilton College	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	A	N	N	N	Y	N	N
Hamline University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N		N	A	N	N
Hampden-Sydney College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Hanover College	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	
Hardin-Simmons University																		
Hartwick College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	

	Prop. # 40	Prop. # 41	Prop. # 42	Prop. # 43	Prop. # 44	Motion to divide #45	Prop. # 45-1	Prop. # 45	Motion to refer Prop#47	Motion to refer #48	Prop. # 48	Prop. # 49	Prop. # 51	Prop. # 54-1	Prop. # 54	Prop. # 55	Motion to Recon. #54	Prop. # 54 re-vote
Haverford College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N		A	A	Y	N	A	
Heidelberg College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	
Hendrix College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	A	A		Y	Y	
Hilbert College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N		Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	
Hiram College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N		N	N	
Hobart and William Smith Colleges	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	
Hollins University																		
Hood College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	A	N	A	A	Y	A	A	
Hope College	Y		Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	
Howard Payne University															Y			
Hunter College		Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y		N	Y	N	N	
Illinois College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	A	Y	Y	
Illinois Wesleyan University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Immaculata College	N	Y	A	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	N	
Ithaca College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	
John Carroll University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	
John Jay College of Criminal Justice																		
Johns Hopkins University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Johnson and Wales University	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	A	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	A	Y	Y	
Johnson State College			Y															
Juniata College			Y															
Kalamazoo College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	
Kean University	Y	Y	Y	Y		N	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Keene State College	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	
Kenyon College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	
Keuka College																		
King's College (Pennsylvania)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	A	N	N	Y			
Knox College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	A	N	
La Roche College	Y	Y		Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	
University of La Verne	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	A	Y	
Lake Erie College	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	
Lake Forest College	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y		N	Y	N	N	Y	N	
Lakeland College																		
Lasell College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	A	A	Y	N	
Lawrence University	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	A	N	
Lebanon Valley College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Lehman College, City University of New York	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	A	Y	N	
Lesley University																		
Lewis and Clark College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y		Y	
Lincoln University (Pennsylvania)			Y															
Linfield College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	
Loras College	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	A	
Luther College																		
Lycoming College																		
Lynchburg College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y		N	N	N	N	A	N	
Macalester College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y		N	N	N	N	A	N	
MacMurray College			Y															
Maine Maritime Academy																		
University of Maine, Farmington	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	A	N	A	A	
Manchester College	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	
Manhattanville College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y						
Maranatha Baptist Bible College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	N	
Marian College (Wisconsin)																		
Marietta College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	
State University of New York Maritime College																		
Martin Luther College																		
Mary Baldwin College																		
University of Mary Hardin-Baylor	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Mary Washington College	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	
Marymount University (Virginia)																		
Maryville College (Tennessee)																		
Maryville University of Saint Louis	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	
Marywood University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	
Massachusetts College of Liberal Arts																		
Massachusetts Institute of Technology	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	A	A	A	N	
Massachusetts Maritime Academy																		
University of Massachusetts, Boston	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	A	A	Y	A	
University of Massachusetts, Dartmouth		Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	
McMurry University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	

3 of 7

	Prop. # 40	Prop. # 41	Prop. # 42	Prop. # 43	Prop. # 44	Motion to divide #45	Prop. # 45-1	Prop. # 45	Motion to refer Prop. #47	Motion to refer #48	Prop. # 48	Prop. # 49	Prop. # 51	Prop. # 54-1	Prop. # 54	Prop. # 55	Motion to Recon. #54	Prop. # 54 re-vote
Medgar Evers College	Y	N	Y	N		N			Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	
Menlo College																		
Meredith College																		
Messiah College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	A	A	Y	Y	Y	
Methodist College	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y						
Middlebury College	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	A	N	N	
Millikin University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Mills College																		
Millsaps College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y			
Milwaukee School of Engineering	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y		N	N	Y	A	N
College Misericordia																		
Mississippi College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
Monmouth College (Illinois)																		
Montclair State University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Moravian College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Mount Holyoke College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	A	A	
College of Mount St. Joseph	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Mount St. Mary College (New York)																		
College of Mount St. Vincent																		
Mount Union College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y		
Muhlenberg College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Muskingum College																		
Nazareth College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Nebraska Wesleyan University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
Neumann College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N
University of New England	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N		N	N	Y	N	N	
New England College	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N			Y	N	N	
New Jersey City University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
The College of New Jersey	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	A	N	Y	Y				
State University College at New Paltz	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	A	Y	Y	Y
College of New Rochelle																		
New York University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Nichols College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y
North Carolina Wesleyan College																		
North Central College																		
North Park University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Norwich University	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
College of Notre Dame (Maryland)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y		N	A	N	Y	A	A
Oberlin College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y		
Occidental College																		
Oglethorpe University																		
Ohio Northern University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y		
Ohio Wesleyan University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	A	A
State University College at Old Westbury																		
Olivet College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y		Y	N	N	N	N	Y	N	
State University College at Oneonta	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
State University College at Oswego	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	A	A
Otterbein College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N		Y	A	Y	Y	N	A	N
University of the Ozarks (Arkansas)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y		N	N	N	Y	Y	Y		
Pacific Lutheran University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	A	Y	Y
Pacific University (Oregon)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	A	A
Pennsylvania State Univ. Erie, the Behrend College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y
Pine Manor College																		
University of Pittsburgh, Bradford	N	N				N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N
Plattsburgh State University of New York	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y
Plymouth State College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Polytechnic University (New York)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	A	A	Y	N	N
Pomona-Pitzer Colleges	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	A	N	N	Y	N	N
State University College at Potsdam	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	N	A	A	Y	A	A	
Principia College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
University of Puget Sound	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N
Ramapo College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Randolph-Macon College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Randolph-Macon Woman's College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	A	Y	A	A	A	A	A
University of Redlands	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y
Regis College (Massachusetts)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y		N		N	Y	A	A	
Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute	N	Y	Y	Y		N	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Rhode Island College	Y	Y	Y	N	Y		N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Rhodes College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

	Prop. # 40	Prop. # 41	Prop. # 42	Prop. # 43	Prop. # 44	Motion to divide #45	Prop. # 45-1	Prop. # 45	Motion to refer Prop #47	Motion to refer #48	Prop. # 48	Prop. # 49	Prop. # 51	Prop. # 54-1	Prop. # 54	Prop. # 55	Motion to Recon. #54	Prop. # 54 re-vote
Richard Stockton College of New Jersey	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	A	Y	A	A	Y	A	A
Ripon College																		
Rivier College																		
Roanoke College																		
University of Rochester	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N
Rochester Institute of Technology	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Rockford College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Roger Williams University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N
Rose-Hulman Institute of Technology	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y
Rosemont College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N
Rowan University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Russell Sage College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Rust College																		
Rutgers, The State Univ. of New Jersey, Camden																		
Rutgers, The State Univ. of New Jersey, Newark	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	A	A	Y	Y	Y
Saint Joseph's College (Maine)																		
Salem State College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	A	A	Y	A	A
Salisbury University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Salve Regina University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N
Savannah College of Art & Design	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	A	A	A	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N
University of Scranton																		
Shenandoah University																		
Simmons College																		
Simpson College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N
Skidmore College	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N
Smith College	Y	Y	Y	Y		A	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N
University of the South	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
University of Southern Maine	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y		A	N		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Southern Vermont College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N		N	Y	A	N	A	Y	A		
Southwestern University (Texas)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	A	Y	Y
Springfield College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N
College of St. Benedict	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	A	A
College of St. Catherine	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N			Y		
College of Saint Elizabeth																		
St. John Fisher College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
St. John's University (Minnesota)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
St. Joseph College (Connecticut)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	A	Y	A	Y	A	A
St. Joseph's College (New York)	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	A	A
St. Lawrence University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Saint Mary's University of Minnesota	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
Saint Mary's College (Indiana)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N
St. Mary's College of Maryland																		
St. Norbert College																		
St. Olaf College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y		N	N	N	Y	N	N
College of St. Scholastica																		
University of St. Thomas (Minnesota)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	A	N	N
College of Staten Island	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y		N	Y	N	N
Stephens College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N
Stevens Institute of Technology	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	A	A	Y	A	A
Stillman College	Y		Y	Y	Y	N	N		Y	Y	N	N	Y	N		Y	N	N
Suffolk University																		
Sul Ross State University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	A	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Susquehanna University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N
Swarthmore College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		N	Y	Y	N	A	N	Y	A	A	Y	N	A
Sweet Briar College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y		Y	N	A	Y				A	
Thiel College																		
Thomas More College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	A	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Trinity College (Connecticut)	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N
Trinity College (District of Columbia)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	N	Y	Y	N	Y	A	N	A	A	Y	A	A
Trinity University (Texas)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Tufts University	N	N	N	Y	Y		N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	A	N	N
U.S. Coast Guard Academy	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	A	N	N
U.S. Merchant Marine Academy	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Union College (New York)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Upper Iowa University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Ursinus College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	
Utica College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	A	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N
State University of New York Institute of Technology																		
Vassar College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	A	A	Y	A	A

	Prop. # 40	Prop. # 41	Prop. # 42	Prop. # 43	Prop. # 44	Motion to divide #45	Prop. # 45-1	Prop. # 45	Motion to refer Prop. #47	Motion to refer #48	Prop. # 48	Prop. # 49	Prop. # 51	Prop. # 54-1	Prop. # 54	Prop. # 55	Motion to Recon. #54	Prop. # 54 re-vote
Villa Julie College																		
Virginia Wesleyan College																		
Wabash College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	
Wartburg College	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	A	N	N	
Washington and Jefferson College			Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	
Washington and Lee University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	
Washington College (Maryland)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Washington University (Missouri)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	
Waynesburg College																		
Webster University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	A	A	
Wellesley College	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	
Wells College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	A	N	A	Y	A	A	
Wentworth Institute of Technology	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	
Wesley College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	
Wesleyan College (Georgia)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	A	A	A	A	A	
Wesleyan University (Connecticut)	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	
Western Connecticut State University	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Western Maryland College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Western New England College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	A		
Westfield State College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	
Westminster College (Missouri)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Wheaton College (Illinois)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Wheaton College (Massachusetts)	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	
Wheelock College																		
Whitman College	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	A	A	A	A	A	A	
Whittier College																		
Whitworth College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N		Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	
Widener University																		
Wilkes University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Willamette University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	
William Paterson University of New Jersey	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Williams College	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	A	N	N	
Wilmington College (Ohio)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N		Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	
Wilson College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	N	Y	Y	N	Y	A	N	A	Y	A	A	
Wisconsin Lutheran College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	N	
University of Wisconsin. Eau Claire	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
University of Wisconsin. La Crosse	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	
University of Wisconsin. Oshkosh	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	A	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	
University of Wisconsin. Platteville	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
University of Wisconsin. River Falls	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
University of Wisconsin. Stevens Point	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	
University of Wisconsin. Stout	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
University of Wisconsin. Superior	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
University of Wisconsin. Whitewater	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	
Wittenberg University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	
College of Wooster	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	
Worcester Polytechnic Institute	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	A	N	N	
Worcester State College																		
Yeshiva University																		
York College (Pennsylvania)																		
York College (New York)	Y	Y	Y		A	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	
American Southwest Conference																		
Atlantic Women's Colleges Conference	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	A	N	A	A	Y	A	A	
Capital Athletic Conference Inc.	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N		Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Centennial Conference	Y	Y	Y	Y		N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	
City University of New York Athletic Conference	N	N	Y		Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	A	A	Y	Y	
College Conference of Illinois & Wisconsin	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Commonwealth Coast Conference	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y		A	
Commonwealth Conference																		
Dixie Intercollegiate Athletic Conference	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Empire 8	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	
Freedom Conference																		
Great Northeast Athletic Conference	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	A		
Heartland Collegiate Athletic Conference	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	
Iowa Intercol. Athletic Conf.	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	
Lake Michigan Conference																		
Little East Conference	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Massachusetts State College Athletic Conference	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	
Michigan Intercol. Ath. Assn.	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	

	Prop. # 40	Prop. # 41	Prop. # 42	Prop. # 43	Prop. # 44	Motion to divide #45	Prop. # 45-1	Prop. # 45	Motion to refer Prop#47	Motion to refer #48	Prop. # 48	Prop. # 49	Prop. # 51	Prop. # 54-1	Prop. # 54	Prop. # 55	Motion to Recon. #54	Prop. # 54 re-vote
Middle Atlantic States Collegiate Athletic Confere	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Midwest Conference	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	A		Y	N	N	A	N	N
Minnesota Intercollegiate Athletic Conference	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	A	N	N	N	N	A	N	N
New England Small College Athletic Conference	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y			N	N	N	N		N	N
New England Women's & Men's Athletics Conference	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N
New Jersey Athletic Conference	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
New York State Women's Collegiate Athletic Assoc.																		
North Coast Athletic Conference	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y		N	Y	A	A	Y	A	A
Northern Illinois-Iowa Conference	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y
Northwest Conference	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Ohio Athletic Conference	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	A	N	N		N	N
Old Dominion Athletic Conf.	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Pennsylvania Athletic Conference	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	A	N	N	Y	A	A	Y	A	A
Presidents' Athletic Conference																		
Skyline Conference																		
Southern California Intercollegiate Athletic Conf.	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Southern Collegiate Athletic Conference	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
St. Louis Intercollegiate Athletic Conference	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	A	A
State University of New York Athletic Conference	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
University Athletic Association	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N		N	A	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Upstate Collegiate Athletic Association	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
Wisconsin Intercollegiate Athletic Conference	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
□																		
Total	341	342	348	343	337	329	343	340	342	339	333	334	339	330	334	323	323	319
Yes	291	297	298	301	307	109	117	273	228	126	243	78	151	105	133	276	158	149
No	46	45	49	42	26	208	218	62	112	211	82	237	182	181	155	9	118	116
Abstain	4	0	1	0	4	12	8	5	2	2	8	19	6	44	46	38	47	54
No Vote	95	94	88	93	99	107	93	96	94	97	103	102	97	106	102	113	113	117